



1970

# Sexual Behavior and Personality Development Among Seminarians

Joseph V. Rizzo  
*Loyola University Chicago*

## Recommended Citation

Rizzo, Joseph V., "Sexual Behavior and Personality Development Among Seminarians" (1970). *Dissertations*. Paper 1051.  
[http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/1051](http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1051)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).  
Copyright © Joseph V. Rizzo

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT  
AMONG SEMINARIANS

by

Joseph V. Rizzo

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

January

1970

## LIFE

Joseph V. Rizzo was born in Chicago, Illinois, on November 24, 1942.

He attended St. Vincent School and was graduated from De Paul Academy in June, 1960, whereupon he matriculated at Loyola University, receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in February, 1964. He began graduate studies at Loyola University in September, 1963, and received a Master of Arts degree in February, 1967.

Mr. Rizzo received his clinical training at the Veterans' Administration Research Hospital and at the Loyola University Center for Guidance and Psychological Service in Chicago during the period from June, 1966, to June, 1969. Currently, he is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Barat College in Lake Forest, Illinois.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This author is greatly indebted to Dr. Frank J. Kobler, his major professor, whose thoughtful help and guidance contributed immeasurably to the completion of this thesis. The assistance of Fr. Michael O'Brien and Dr. James Erdmann have also been invaluable with suggestions concerning methodology and statistical analysis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PURPOSE.....	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	5
A. Dating and Personality Development.....	5
B. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.....	11
C. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.....	15
D. Bardis Dating Scale.....	17
E. Semantic Differential.....	18
III. PROCEDURE.....	24
A. Sample.....	24
B. Method.....	25
C. Hypotheses and Procedures for Data Analysis	29
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	33
A. Bardis Dating Scale.....	33
B. Questionnaire Responses.....	41
C. Personality Instruments: MMPI, EPPS, Semantic Differential.....	69
V. SUMMARY.....	95
ABSTRACT.....	99
REFERENCES.....	100
APPENDIX I.....	107
APPENDIX II.....	120
APPENDIX III.....	130

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Current Dating Frequency and Other Heterosexual and Autosexual Variables.....	36
2. Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Dating Frequency Groups on the Bardis Dating Scale.....	37
3. Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on Bardis Dating Scale: Groups N, S, O, F and VO.....	39
4. Means and Standard Deviations of Items 4, 9, 16, 19, 23 of the Bardis Dating Scale....	40
5. Percentages of Seminary Students Engaging in Dating and Forms of Sexual Behavior.....	47
6. Percentages of Seminary Students Engaging in Autosexual Behavior Within Each Dating Frequency Group.....	49
7. Percentages of Non-daters Offering Various Reasons for Not Dating.....	55
8. Percentages of All Dating Students Offering Various Reasons for Dating.....	57
9. Percentages of Students Dating "Seldom" Offering Various Reasons for Dating.....	58
10. Percentages of Students Dating "Occasional- ly" Offering Various Reasons for Dating.....	59
11. Percentages of Students Dating "Frequently" and "Very Often" Offering Various Reasons for Dating.....	60

Table	Page
12. Students' Conceptions of Seminary Dating Policy.....	64
13. Students' Conceptions of Ideal Seminary Policy on Dating.....	65
14. Students' Estimations of Effects of Seminary Policy on Their Development.....	68
15. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Current Dating Frequency Groups on Selected MMPI Scales....	71
16. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Current Dating Frequency Groups on Selected EPPS Scales.....	73
17. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Heterosexual Behavior and MMPI Scales.....	76
18. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Heterosexual Behavior and EPPS Scales.....	77
19. "D" Score Ranks Between the Concepts "Me" and "Myself as I Would Like to Be".....	83
20. "D" Score Ranks Between the Concepts "Me" and "Man".....	85

## CHAPTER I

### PURPOSE

"Without a full realization of the meaning of sexuality and human love, marriage, and family life, the future priest cannot make the kind of sacrificial act which his vocation demands [Hagmaier & Kennedy, 1965]." With this brief statement, two of the foremost authorities on the psychological development of the priesthood candidate summarize a problem which is currently undergoing intense re-examination among seminary faculties and students. (McCarthy, 1968).

Traditionally, the priesthood candidate has been discouraged--more often outrightly forbidden--from engaging in explicitly heterosexual relationships in view of his ultimate commitment to the celibate life. Today, many feel that an informed decision for celibacy cannot be made without some basis in the individual's own experiences with females. That is, the seminarian should, by virtue of his own experiences with the opposite sex, realize what it is that he is giving up. It is further believed



that the effectiveness of the priest is contingent upon his maturity and self-insight, and upon his ability to empathize with the problems of his congregation. This kind of effectiveness does not develop in a vacuum. It requires that the priest has had the opportunity to work through core problems in relating to authority and in relating to women (Hagmaier & Kennedy, 1965). Consequent upon this kind of reasoning is the conclusion that many, if not most, seminarians require the opportunity to relate to women in a kind of relationship in which heterosexual differences are not denied or ignored, but instead are used as a vehicle for personal development and mutual growth and satisfaction. Typically, the kind of relationship implied is a dating relationship. Through the practice of dating a male and a female may come to know each other as individuals and to understand the needs and feelings of the opposite sex. This is not to say that dating is the only way or even the best way of developing such understanding. Yet its prevalence and importance in our culture (Ehrmann, 1959; Reiss, 1960; Smith, 1962) make it a pivotal experience in the course of adolescent development, an experience about which the individual must come to some decision in terms of his own needs and his conception of his future.

In the past this decision has not been left to the seminarian to make but has been made for him more or less categorically. What is called for then, according to some, is an opportunity for the seminarian to decide whether or not to date in relation to needs he feels and questions which he must, at least partially, answer for himself.

Regardless of whether one feels committed to or more comfortable with either a traditional or contemporary view of the problem of heterosexual relationships and personality development in the priesthood candidate, one fact remains clear and indisputable: that fact is, simply, that there is a dearth of relevant, empirical information in regard to the issue. It does little good to call for alterations of traditional practices unless there is a sound basis for believing that these changes will be beneficial. Similarly, traditional practices cannot be viewed as valuable simply because they are traditional. Rather, they must demonstrate their worth. In either case, debate without an examination of the facts is pointless when information is available. It is the purpose of the present study to gather such information.

Stated more formally, the purpose of this investigation is to explore and describe the heterosexual behavior of

priesthood candidates. This basic step has repeatedly been overlooked and ignored. With some conception of what seminarians actually do and think in regard to heterosexual relationships, it may be possible to make some preliminary statements concerning the relationships between heterosexual practices and adequacy of personality development. With some idea of what is actually happening, investigation may later proceed with greater precision and in the most profitable directions.

Although this investigation is exploratory, several hypotheses have been formulated as heuristic devices to facilitate organization and analysis of the data. These hypotheses will be stated briefly at this point and thoroughly elaborated in the discussion of methodology.

1. It is hypothesized that a direct relationship exists between frequency of dating and adjustment adequacy among seminarians.
2. It is hypothesized that seminarians differing in frequency of dating will exhibit differences in self-acceptance.
3. It is hypothesized that seminarians differing in frequency of dating will exhibit differences in sex-role identification.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Dating and Personality Development

In a recent review of the psychological and sociological literature related to dating and heterosexual behavior, Kobler, Rizzo, and Doyle (1967) stated that virtually all the research that has been done in this area has been of a demographic and descriptive nature or has been focussed specifically on the nature and frequency of overt sexual contacts. Kinsey (1948), Ehrmann (1959), Reiss (1960), and Smith (1962) have conducted the most careful and comprehensive studies of this type. Yet despite the scope of these studies, the data they present are essentially inapplicable to such atypical populations as students preparing for the priesthood. Normative standards in regard to patterns of dating behavior or frequency of particular kinds of sexual contacts and outlets cannot be applied to a population which is limited in heterosexual contacts both in terms of the practical question of physical limitations inherent in the seminary environment,

and the broader issue of an ultimate commitment to the celibate life. Further, such data are limited in regard to the questions raised here since they do not deal with the possible personality correlates of given categories of heterosexual behavior. More specifically, such studies have not attempted to determine whether, for example, there are significant personality differences between those who do not date and those who date moderately or often. Any number of similar questions could be raised and would be of great practical and theoretical significance, but they are beyond the scope of the typical survey of heterosexual norms and practices.

A few studies have been conducted over the past thirty years which deal more directly with the relationships between heterosexual behavior and personality adequacy. One of the earliest of these was an investigation by Strang (1937) involving the questionnaire responses of high school and college students. Strang found that respondents generally agreed that heterosexual contacts helped them to feel more at ease with the opposite sex and contributed greatly to feelings of social self-confidence.

Another early study (Willoughby, 1937) employed a sample of 2200 women. Willoughby found that students from women's colleges constituted seventy-five percent

of a subsample of homosexual women while students from coeducational schools made up only one-fifth of the homosexual subsample. From this data Willoughby concludes that "withdrawing types of personality find this (homosexual) adjustment less formidable than a heterosexual one and that anomalous environments such as prisons or the average women's college can force anomalous expressions upon normal impulses [Willoughby, 1937, p.35]." Certainly Willoughby's conclusions are suspect. There is no recognition, for example, that previously homosexually oriented individuals may seek out such "anomalous environments" or that the relationships between personality characteristics and environment are much too complex to be encompassed in such simple conclusions. Despite the tenuousness of the conclusions, however, the study is relevant. It implies that the analogously atypical seminary environment may not be conducive to optimal heterosexual adjustment in a certain proportion of individuals.

Landis (1940) conducted an investigation among single and married women classified as normal and abnormal. His data indicate that a significantly larger proportion of normal women had their first date before the age of sixteen, and that significantly more abnormal women

had never dated a male. Furthermore, nearly thirty percent of his abnormal group had never engaged in heterosexual physical intimacies while none of the normal group reported this.

In a comprehensive study of Catholic adolescents Fleege (1945) administered questionnaires and inventories to 2200 students from 20 different high schools in 18 cities and across 12 states. The analysis of his data is quite extensive, but the most relevant findings indicate that heterosexual fantasies are most likely to have a harmful effect, at least morally, on those boys who never go out with girls. Extending this conclusion somewhat, it seems likely that guilt feelings induced by sexual fantasies are potentially problematic and may lead to difficulties in self-acceptance and lowered self-esteem.

Nimkoff and Wood (1947) administered a dating behavior questionnaire along with the Bell Adjustment Inventory to 500 students attending a coeducational college. Their findings indicate that students who have never or only rarely dated tend to be socially withdrawn with a tendency to be maladjusted.

A more recent study (Lucas, 1960) leads to somewhat similar conclusions, though indirectly. Lucas administered an experimental version of an inventory designed to assess

needs to a group of adolescents, both male and female. A revised form of the instrument was subsequently administered to 725 males and female adolescents. Factor analysis revealed several need clusters, among them an unpredicted need cluster involving heterosexual affection and attention.

On a theoretical level, there tends to be general agreement that heterosexual association is virtually essential for normal development. Schneiders (1960), for example, sees dating as a more or less inevitable part of the adolescent's healthy maturation. While Schneiders feels that many dating practices may be morally questionable, he does not see any question but that they are vitally important in the psychological development of the individual. Furthermore, he believes that "the more complete the adjustment of the individual along heterosexual lines, and the higher his development level, the less likely is the problem of masturbation to persist [Schneiders, 1960, p. 135]."

Beigel (1961) seems to concur in these conclusions, indicating that "in young people, (heterosexual) abstinence is apt to increase sexual desire and to evoke an abundance of sexual imagery. This may result in inability to concentrate, irritability, insomnia, extreme nervousness,



or more serious complications. . . [p. 48]." However, Beigel notes that coerced sexual abstinence is more likely to result in personality difficulties than is voluntary abstinence.

Hurlock (1967) suggests that dating serves a number of important functions in adolescent development and that the advantages of dating clearly outweigh any associated disadvantages. In her view the non-dater tends to be at a clear disadvantage in contemporary American culture and to experience a good deal of difficulty in adequate socialization. Similar views are presented by Rogers (1962) and Cole and Hall (1965).

In view of this kind of empirical and theoretical information it is reasonable to suppose that differences in dating behavior may be reflected in different levels of personality adequacy. At the same time, however, it is also evident that what evidence is available is meager, at best. Little of the research that has been done has any direct bearing on the priesthood candidate, whose reasons for dating or not dating do not necessarily coincide with those of the general population of American adolescents. Consequently, this study is directed toward developing a body of empirical information which will be directly oriented toward dating behavior and its relationship to

personality characteristics among priesthood candidates.

#### B. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is currently one of the most frequently used instruments for screening and assessment of candidates for the religious life (Dunn, 1968). As a consequence, a small body of research literature has developed which is specifically directed toward evaluation of the MMPI as an assessment instrument for use with seminary populations.

One of the earliest of these studies was conducted by Bier (1948) in an attempt to determine whether MMPI norms derived from standardization populations were applicable to specific vocational subgroups. Bier compared MMPI scores of seminarians with groups of medical and dental students and with law students. A subgroup of college undergraduates completed his sample. Bier found that his seminary subgroup had consistently higher MMPI scores than any of the other subgroups. At the same time, however, discrepancies between scores of well-adjusted and poorly-adjusted seminarians were larger than discrepancies between well-adjusted seminarians and well-adjusted members of other subgroups. Similarly, poorly-adjusted seminarians more closely resembled poorly-adjusted members of other vocational subgroups than they

did well-adjusted seminarians. On the basis of these findings Bier concluded that special MMPI norms for seminarians are unnecessary, and that adjustment indices need not be developed for different vocational subgroups.

However, Bier was still faced with the problem of accounting for consistently higher MMPI scores among seminarians even though the test was differentiating between well- and poorly-adjusted seminary students. Item analysis suggested that higher scores among seminarians might be due to inapplicable item content. Consequently, Bier introduced modifications into the MMPI designed to correct for distortions due to the presence of items which are inappropriate for seminarians (Bier, 1956). Instead of reducing discrepancies between seminary groups and general norms, Bier's modified MMPI seemed only to increase them since seminarians' scores on this modification were even higher (Dunn, 1968). According to Dunn (1968, p.127) "this finding would appear to support the contention of...Welsh and Dahlstrom (1956, p.561), that it is unnecessary to restandardize or to change items in the test for particular populations." An additional reason for avoiding modifications such as that suggested by Bier is that the massive body of MMPI validation research might not be applicable to modified

forms of the test (Healy, 1968).

Bier's reports have been emphasized here because they raise questions which are important in the present study. First, there is the question of applicability of MMPI norms to a specific, atypical population. After reviewing most of the research on the use of the MMPI with seminary or religious populations, Dunn (1968) concludes that there is no adequate basis for questioning the use of the MMPI with seminary populations. Discrepancies in scores between the general population and groups of priesthood candidates and religious are seen as reflecting the fact that "a considerable amount of deviation is tolerable in the religious life [Dunn, 1968, p. 133]," and not as an indication that the MMPI is inapplicable to seminarians.

The second question raised by Bier's studies involves the utility of the MMPI as an instrument for discriminating between well-adjusted and poorly-adjusted seminarians. Bier's findings demonstrated that such discrimination is possible. Later investigators were also able to develop such discriminative indices. Gorman (1961) and McDonagh (1961) empirically developed cutoff scores which efficiently separated well-adjusted from poorly-adjusted seminary students.

It is necessary, however, to qualify the results of these studies, at least for purposes of the present investigation. The MMPI is, of course, a clinical instrument and is saturated with items reflecting serious pathology. While useful as a screening or diagnostic device, it may not be sufficiently sensitive to real and meaningful differences in adjustment adequacy among a population that is essentially normal (Lingoes, 1965; Adcock, 1965). Further, it has been demonstrated that MMPI responses of normal subjects are directly related to the social desirability of MMPI items (Edwards, 1964). Finally, direct dissimulation may also be a factor influencing the MMPI responses of normal subjects (Megargee, 1966).

These qualifications are not intended as disparagements of the MMPI as a clinical instrument. When used appropriately, "the MMPI has a definite contribution to make and is unequalled." (Lingoes, 1965, p.317). In those instances in which finer discriminations are sought among normals, supplementary assessment instruments are needed. This is the case in the present study. The MMPI is employed here to determine whether differences in adequacy of adjustment among seminarians correlate with dating behavior. To answer further questions concerning

differential adjustment among seminarians within the normal range, supplementary assessment techniques are needed.

### C. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) "was designed primarily as an instrument for research and counseling purposes, to provide a quick and convenient measure of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables [Edwards, 1959, p. 5]." The EPPS would thus seem to provide precisely the kind of information necessary to supplement the clinical data provided by the MMPI. Additionally, EPPS norms are available for college student samples, and an attempt has been made to control for distortions arising from social desirability of item content and dissimulation (Edwards, 1959).

Unfortunately, for the purposes of the present study, the EPPS has not been used extensively in studies of seminary populations. Two recent investigations have provided some evidence of construct validity and utility of the EPPS with seminary students. Rakowski (1965) administered the EPPS to a sample of junior college seminarians. He found that students not completing the junior college seminary program tended to exhibit higher

scores on the EPPS scales reflecting needs for heterosexuality and for change. Students persevering in the seminary program exhibited higher scores on nurturance, affiliation, and intraception.

In a study of over 700 junior college seminarians, Healy (1968) found similar relationships between salient needs and persistence in the seminary program. Those withdrawing from the seminary exhibited significantly higher scores on change and heterosexuality. Healy does not present data on the nurturance and affiliation scales, but his findings on the intraception scale are similar to those of Rakowski, with students persisting in the program exhibiting higher scores than withdrawals.

The findings of these two studies can be interpreted as contributing to the construct validity of the EPPS since the salient needs of both groups as related to persistence or withdrawal are predictable in view of the special nature of seminary life. That is, needs for heterosexuality and change are not compatible with seminary restrictions and the routinization of activities. Conversely, nurturance, affiliation, and intraception are characteristics appropriate to the demands of seminary life and a vocation to the diocesan priesthood.

#### D. Bardis Dating Scale

This 25-item Likert type scale was developed by P.T. Bardis to assess liberality or permissiveness of attitudes toward dating (Bardis, 1962). The scale has not been widely used in research on dating attitudes, but some data regarding reliability and validity are available. In one study, corrected split-half reliability coefficients of .93 and .79 are reported for samples of 32 males and 32 females, respectively (Bardis, 1962). A corrected split-half reliability coefficient of .86 was reported for a group of American adults, and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 was reported for a sample of 31 male and female undergraduates at a midwestern university (Bardis, 1962).

In addition to evident content validity, Bardis (1962) has demonstrated that males have significantly higher scores than females; also Americans have significantly higher scores than persons born in Greece. These findings correspond to "known" attitudes of these groups (Breed, 1956; Bardis, 1958) and constitute some evidence of construct validity. Shaw and Wright (1967) conclude that "this is a short, easily administered scale with adequate reliability and minimal evidence of validity (p.102)." A decision was made to employ the scale in



this study despite evident limitations because it provides a quick, straightforward estimate of overall student attitudes toward dating (Shaw & Wright, 1967). Its liabilities are not a danger to the study since the instrument serves merely as a descriptive supplement to more detailed information.

#### E. Semantic Differential

Though it is a widely used research technique, the semantic differential has not previously been employed in studies of seminary populations. Consequently, this review will focus on semantic differential research using methodological approaches similar to the one employed in the present investigation. These studies will necessarily involve divergent samples.

One of the earliest semantic differential studies, and one which has become a more or less classic example of personality research employing the semantic differential was conducted by Osgood and Luria (1954). In this study Osgood and Luria analyzed semantic differential data obtained from three different personalities of a patient exhibiting a dissociative reaction. (This patient was the subject of Thigpen's and Cleckley's Three Faces of Eve, 1957). The only information that the authors had concerning the patient were the names of the different

"personalities," the patient's sex and marital status, and semantic differential ratings of 15 concepts rated on 10 bipolar adjective scales. The investigators were interested in comparing semantic structures of the three personalities and employed the "D-statistic" (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) as a measure of rating discrepancies. Additionally, three-dimensional graphic depiction of the semantic space for each of the subject's personalities was developed and presented. On the basis of discrepancy measures ("D") and semantic structure, the authors developed "blind" characterizations of the different personalities.

While quantitative indices of the accuracy of these characterizations are not possible, the authors' descriptions are, on an intuitive basis, strikingly accurate and correspond closely to descriptions provided by the patient's therapists (Thigpen & Cleckley, 1954, 1957). The results of this study attest to the discriminative capacity of the semantic differential and provide some evidence of construct validity.

Endler (1961) employed the semantic differential in a study of changes in the meanings of relevant concepts as a consequence of psychotherapy. Twenty-two clients rated the concepts, "me," "father," and "mother" before

beginning psychotherapy and at the completion of therapy. Ratings of the concept, "me" before and after therapy were employed as measures of subjects' self-concepts. Using Osgood's "D-statistic" as an index of change in self-concept, Endler hypothesized that improvement in self-concept would be correlated with therapists' estimates of improvement. His results indicated significant correlation between improved self-concept as assessed by the semantic differential and therapist ratings of improvement.

In finding evidence to support his hypothesis Endler incidentally produced evidence attesting to the construct validity of the semantic differential. A more direct investigation of the validity of the semantic differential was conducted by Grigg (1959). In this study a group of normal subjects rated a series of concepts including "ideal self," "neurotic," and "self." Again, the D-statistic was employed as an index of profile similarity among ratings. Subjects' ratings indicated significantly greater semantic distances between the concepts, "ideal self" and "neurotic" than between "self" and "neurotic." Grigg interprets this finding as favorable to the validity of the semantic differential. Additional aspects of the same study showed that subjects' ratings of a fictitious

person changed as a function of whether this person was perceived as normal or neurotic.

Stratton and Spitzer (1967) investigated the relationships between sexual permissiveness and self-evaluation. A group of 325 male and female undergraduates completed a biographical data sheet, an adjective checklist, and a form of the semantic differential developed by Fiedler (1959). The authors defined sexual permissiveness as an affirmative answer to the question, "I believe it is all right (sic) for a male (female) to engage in full sexual relationships before marriage when he is engaged." It was hypothesized that highly permissive subjects would exhibit negative self-concepts as measured by a semantic differential self-ideal self discrepancy. The hypothesis was supported by the results of the study.

Friedman and Gladden (1964) conducted a methodological study in which an attempt was made to quantify the social-psychological construct of "role." Subjects rated 8 different social roles on a form of the semantic differential under varying instructional procedures. Support was obtained for what is described as a central assumption of role theorists; that is, that there is consensual agreement across subjects concerning the various characteristics associated with specific roles. Again,

incidental evidence is here adduced for the construct validity of the semantic differential.

While the semantic differential has repeatedly demonstrated its utility as a practical assessment procedure in personality research and in quantification of connotative meanings of words, the technique remains a subject of theoretical controversy.

Cliff (1959), for example, suggests that it is unclear whether adverbial qualifiers used in semantic differential adjective scales combine in additive or multiplicative fashion, though he adduces evidence for the latter. Norman (1959) conducted a methodological study of the semantic differential using an extensive sample of over 500 college students. His results indicate that individual semantic spaces may be quite unstable, though group "D" values exhibit a rather high degree of stability. Additional controversy involves the generality of the evaluative, activity, and potency factors proposed by Osgood (1957), with some authors suggesting that these factors are not general across concepts or populations (Weinrich, 1958; Carroll, 1959), while others (Brown, 1958) cite evidence to the contrary.

This sampling of semantic differential research literature provides sufficient evidence to permit at least

two conclusions which are relevant to the present study. First, there is no doubt that the semantic differential has been the subject of extensive theoretical and methodological criticism (Cliff, 1959; Norman, 1959; Ford & Meisels, 1965; Deese, 1964). At the same time, however, a second point is also clear. The semantic differential technique has repeatedly demonstrated its utility as a means of assessing intra-individual personality characteristics (Osgood & Luria, 1954; Endler, 1961), and as a means of assessing consistencies in conceptual meanings within groups which have been selected on the basis of specific behavioral criteria (Grigg, 1959; Stratton & Spitzer, 1967; Suci, 1960; Maltz, 1963).

In summary, though the semantic differential is still a topic of extensive theoretical controversy, it exhibits practical utility as an assessment procedure and is certainly unusual among personality assessment devices in its flexibility and adaptability.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### A. Sample

All subjects were taken from a sample of first year college students studying for the priesthood at a large, metropolitan, diocesan seminary. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 20 years with a mean age of 18.306 years. Subjects also shared similar background characteristics. Virtually all subjects have attended parochial grade schools and non-coeducational high schools which are directed toward the preparation of priesthood candidates. Socioeconomic background of the students is typically middle and lower middle class. Subjects, additionally, come largely from intact, Catholic families.

All subjects live on campus during regular school periods so that they experience an inherent limitation on heterosexual associations. However, there are opportunities for dating available to these students, both overtly and covertly, and seminary policy permits some dating at the discretion of the student's spiritual

and psychological counselors. Formal statements of policy promulgated by the seminary administration include the following principles:

1. The seminary is against steady dating.
2. The seminary approves and encourages semi-social group activities.
3. The seminary is against any kind of dating between steady dating and semi-social group activities without consultation with a spiritual director or psychological counselor.
4. Since the presence of young women on seminary grounds would create obvious complications, seminarians should not invite or receive young women in the seminary environs.

#### B. Method

Prior to beginning college, all subjects were given a battery of personality tests including the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Data from these sources were available for all subjects (N=105). Protocols from several students had to be eliminated because data was incomplete, but the remaining 105 students for whom complete data was available constituted approximately two-thirds of the freshman class.

Initially it was hoped that the entire freshman class would be available for testing at the end of the freshman year, but a number of students did not arrive for scheduled testing sessions. The possibility naturally arose that the students who did complete the test battery constituted a biased sample. Consequently,



a group of 12 students who did not appear for testing was subsequently contacted. These students were interviewed individually in order to determine their reasons for not appearing during test sessions. The objective of these interviews was to determine whether any systematic biasing factor had caused certain students to absent themselves from testing. Within this sample of absentees six students had been attending the funeral of a parent of a classmate. Five students had attended an intermural school baseball game, and one had decided to play golf instead of presenting himself for testing. This latter group of six students was unanimous in offering the explanation that since the testing occurred during regular class periods, and since their instructors would not be present, they would have "an easy cut," and an opportunity to escape classroom routine. All of the students interviewed subsequently volunteered to cooperate in completing the test battery without being asked to do so. Further, the students interviewed indicated that it was their belief that classmates who had absented themselves from testing had done so for similar reasons.

Subsequently, the protocols of these students were examined to determine if any systematic biasing factors would appear, but this group of students appeared

representative of the sample that had been tested at the time initially specified. Consequently, these protocols were included with the remainder of the student protocols and are included in the previously specified N.

The battery of materials which students were asked to complete during these testing sessions included:

1. The Bardis Dating Scale (cf., Appendix I).
2. A semantic differential scale with ratings of a series of concepts on 10 bipolar adjective scales. The specific scales employed were adapted from Osgood (1957) and were used by Shell, O'Malley, and Johnsgard (1964) in a study of inferred identification. Several of the concepts included were also used by Shell and his associates in addition to concepts employed as being pertinent to the present study. In preparing materials for administration, the positions of the bipolar adjective scales were varied in order to avoid the development of response sets. In addition, the order in which various concepts were presented for rating was also varied to control for the possible development of systematic contextual effects. The format for presentation of the semantic differential rating scales may be examined in Appendix I.
3. A questionnaire designed to elicit information

concerning the frequency and intimacy of heterosexual behavior and dating experiences, information concerning autosexual behavior, and attitudes toward seminary policy regarding dating (cf., Appendix I). This questionnaire is a considerably shortened and modified revision of a pilot questionnaire administered to a sample of high school students studying for the priesthood. Summary data from the pilot questionnaire along with the questionnaire items may be examined in Appendix II. On the basis of this pilot administration items were clarified, altered, or deleted in order to produce a more useful source of information. One change requires detailed explanation. In the initial questionnaire students were asked to describe the frequencies of dating in terms of specific categories (eg., "once per month," "weekly or more often"). In the present questionnaire such categories have been omitted. Instead students were asked to respond in terms of the categories, "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," "Frequently," and "Very Often." This alteration was made for a specific reason. One of the objectives of this study is an assessment of the relationship between dating frequency and self-concept. In order to explore such a relationship, the crucial information regarding

dating should be phenomenological and ipsative information, as opposed to data forced into specific numerical categories. Thus, a student's estimation that he is dating "occasionally" is seen as more important in relation to his self-concept than the fact that he dates once every six months or once every two months. Additionally, numerical frequencies pose interpretive problems when applied to an atypical seminary population. A seminarian dating once a month may feel that he is dating "frequently," and he may be right in view of his environment, though objectively this frequency might be quite low for a non-seminarian (Ehrmann, 1959, p.50). In brief, a sacrifice in specificity was made in order to obtain data which is more closely related to the subject's self-image.

### C. Hypotheses and Procedures for Data Analysis

Since a number of different assessment instruments have been employed in this study, data analysis is somewhat lengthy and complex though the specific techniques that have been employed are generally straightforward. Both parametric and non-parametric techniques are used depending on the nature of the specific variables in question.

1. The first step in the analysis of the collected data consists of summaries and descriptive statistics

indicating the frequency and intimacy of heterosexual contacts engaged in by this sample of seminary students. In addition, free response items were converted into categorical responses so that they could be handled in quantitative fashion. The data involved in these analyses come largely from the questionnaire and the Bardis Dating Scale.

2. It is hypothesized that a direct relationship exists between frequency of dating and adjustment adequacy among seminarians (cf., p.4). Dating is defined as "going out with a member of the opposite sex and excludes double and multiple dates and mixers." (cf., Appendix I). The criterion of dating frequency is student responses to questionnaire item two: "How often are you dating currently?" Students responded in terms of the categories, "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," "Frequently," and "Very Often." As will be shown later, responses to this questionnaire item proved to be the best single index of overall heterosexual behavior. Adjustment adequacy is defined operationally as the mean of a subject's scores on the 10 standard MMPI clinical scales. Evidence to support this hypothesis would consist of a negative correlation between dating frequency and mean MMPI scores.

3. It is hypothesized that seminarians differing in frequency of dating will exhibit differences in self-acceptance. In this case, categories of dating frequency are employed as an independent organismic variable (Edwards, 1950). Self-acceptance is operationally defined as the discrepancy between subjects' semantic differential ratings of the concepts, "Me," and "Myself as I Would Like to Be." This semantic distance may be expressed quantitatively by means of the "D-statistic" (Osgood, et.al., 1957). "D" is a measure of semantic distance between concepts either for groups or for individuals and is derived from a method of assessing profile similarities developed by Cronbach and Gleser (1953). Data are analyzed by means of the Kruskal-Wallace one-way analysis of variance (Siegel, 1956). The more traditional F-test is inappropriate here since the distribution of "D" is unknown and probably not normal in shape (Osgood, et.al., 1957). Similar use of discrepancies in semantic differential ratings is reported by Osgood and Luria (1954), Endler (1961), and Shell, O'Malley, and Johnsgard (1964).
4. It is hypothesized that seminarians differing in frequency of dating will exhibit differences in sex-role identification. Again, categories of dating frequency

are employed as an independent organismic variable (Edwards, 1950), and sex-role identification is operationally defined as the discrepancy between semantic differential ratings of the concepts, "Me," and "Man."

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Bardis Dating Scale

The first instrument which all subjects completed in the battery of materials presented to them was the Bardis Dating Scale (Appendix I). It will be recalled that the Dating Scale was included as a supplementary instrument used to gather information concerning the attitudes of seminarians toward heterosexual behavior and to attempt to assess the extent of the relationship between attitudes and behavior.

Social psychologists debate about the direction of causality between attitudes and behavior, some suggesting that attitudes are primary determining factors of actual behavior, while others (dissonance theorists, for example) believe that behavior may serve as a causal factor modifying or more firmly entrenching existing attitudes (Insko, 1967). Still others adopt the view that the relationship between attitudes and behavior may be a reciprocal one, each influencing the other in



circular fashion (Insko, 1967). Despite the diversity of views concerning causality in the attitude-behavior relationship, there is agreement that the two are correlated and parallel each other in some systematic fashion. It was expected that this kind of relationship would be evident in a parallel between seminarians' attitudes toward heterosexual behavior and their actual behavior.

In assessing this relationship current dating behavior was used as a criterion. Students were divided into several groups on the basis of their answers to the question, "How often are you dating currently?" In answering this questionnaire item students were required to make a personal assessment of the frequency of their own dating and to respond by selecting from the following alternatives: Never (N); Seldom (S); Occasionally (O); Frequently (F); Very Often (VO). Subjects were initially classified into five dating frequency groups in this manner, but an extremely small N in groups F and VO necessitated the combining of these groups for some analyses. This step is also logically meaningful since students dating frequently and very often are more similar to each other in regard to dating frequency than either is to any other group.

An additional point should be made here concerning the use of current dating frequency as a criterion variable. Responses to this item serve as the best single index of overall heterosexual behavior. Spearman rank correlation coefficients ( $\rho$ ) were computed between current dating frequency and dating frequency prior to entering college, frequency of necking, petting, sexual intercourse, masturbation, and sexual fantasies. These correlations are summarized in Table 1, and indicate that current dating frequency is significantly correlated with all items pertaining to heterosexual behavior except sexual intercourse. At the same time, current dating frequency is not significantly correlated with items pertaining to autosexual behavior. Thus, current dating frequency may be assumed to reflect heterosexual behavior generally.

After students were classified in the manner described, means and standard deviations of dating scale scores were computed for each of the criterion groups (N, S, O, F, VO) and for the total sample. These descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 2.

Initially, it seemed as though the means were sufficiently different from each other to confirm the expectation of a relationship between dating attitudes and dating frequency. In order to test the significance of the

TABLE 1

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Current Dating Frequency and Other Heterosexual and Autosexual Variables

Variable X	Variable Y	rho
Current Dating Frequency	Dating Frequency Prior to College	.64*
Current Dating Frequency	Necking	.56*
Current Dating Frequency	Petting	.47*
Current Dating Frequency	Sexual Intercourse	.16
Current Dating Frequency	Masturbation	.16
Current Dating Frequency	Sexual Fantasies	.03

\* $p < .05$

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Dating  
Frequency Groups on the Bardis Dating Scale

	Never	Seldom	Occasion- ally	Frequently Very Often	Total
Mean	38.56	41.22	38.39	46.43	39.87
Standard Deviation	10.73	7.63	6.55	10.25	9.45

differences among means a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the data from the dating frequency groups. Computational formulas were employed for unequal N's with means weighted proportionally to their representation, since there was no basis for assumptions concerning equality of representation in the total population from which the sample was drawn (Winer, 1962, pp. 96ff., 222ff., 374). Table 3 presents a summary of this analysis. Contrary to expectations, there is no significant difference among the several dating frequency groups ( $F=1.819$ ;  $p>.05$ ). Furthermore, what differences do exist do not present any definable trends. The mean differences are not distributed according to any interpretable pattern.

Inspection of score distributions from individual items presented an additional analytical possibility. Certain items of the Bardis Dating Scale are clearly emotionally loaded in contrast to items which are intellectually oriented. Items 4, 9, 16, 19, and 23 are the specific items referred to here as bearing greater emotional impact. These items were scored separately, and again means and standard deviations were computed. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 4. The mean scores on these items for the four groups are so close that further analysis was not carried out.

TABLE 3

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
Bardis Dating Scale: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	160.29	1.82
Error	101	88.07	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Items 4, 9, 16, 19, 23  
of the Bardis Dating Scale: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
Mean	8.69	10.00	9.23	10.00
Standard Deviation	2.93	2.62	1.90	3.96

Summarizing the results of these analyses of responses to the Bardis Dating Scale, there are no differences in liberality or permissiveness of attitudes toward dating as a function of frequency of dating among this sample of diocesan seminarians.

#### B. Questionnaire Responses

Upon completion of the Bardis Dating Scale, subjects responded to the questionnaire items concerning dating activity, sexual behavior, and views toward seminary policies regarding dating (cf., Appendix I). It is the data from this instrument which constitute the core of this study and relate most directly to the objective of determining the nature of heterosexual contacts among seminarians.

Questionnaire items 1 and 2 inquired into the frequency of dating both prior to entering the college seminary and at the time of the study, one year later. Results indicate that prior to beginning college 56.19% of the students surveyed were dating. At the time of the study this percentage had declined slightly, with 54.28% of the sample dating. These results clearly indicate that dating is not a practice limited to a few atypical seminarians. On the contrary, both at the high school level and at least during the first year in college, the majority of



students in this diocesan seminary engaged in at least minimal dating activity.

Among those students who are currently dating, the largest group (35% dating seldom) engages in minimal contact with the opposite sex. More extensive heterosexual contacts are reported by 17% of the subjects who date occasionally, while intense involvement in heterosexual relationships is characteristic of only a few students (5% dating frequently; 2% dating very often). Incidentally, "intense involvement" does not necessarily imply intimacy with a particular female; it may also indicate involvement with dating as a practice since those students dating frequently and very often report dating an average of 11 different girls.

By way of summary, the data from questionnaire items 1 and 2 indicate that dating is a common practice among the seminarians in this sample, although extensive dating is not prevalent. The fact that a large number of students do date raises the possibility that even those who do not date have, in a certain proportion of cases, made a decision not to do so. The alternative that non-daters have avoided the issue of dating in purely passive fashion is unlikely in view of the extent of dating among their classmates. Dating frequency data are summarized in

Table 5.

In addition to information concerning the extent of dating behavior, students were also asked to report the extent to which they engaged in more explicitly sexual behavior (questionnaire items 15 through 19). Of the students surveyed, the largest group (69%) reported that they had never engaged in necking. This group includes those students who have never dated, but it also includes 24% of those students who have dated at one time or another. Unfortunately, students were not asked to discuss their reasons for engaging in necking on dates or for not doing so. Consequently, it is impossible to determine why 24% of those students who have dated have not attempted more explicitly sexual behavior. On a purely speculative level, it seems probable that a combination of factors prevented these students from engaging in necking, including moral restraints, shyness, failure to perceive opportunities, and fear of rejection. These conjectural restraining factors were probably operative regardless of the amount of a given individual's dating experience since the incidence of necking is considerably lower than dating frequency at every frequency level (See Table 5).

The incidence of petting was even more infrequent than

the incidence of necking, representing as it does, a more advanced level of sexual intimacy. A total of 77% of the students surveyed had never engaged in petting. Only 17% reported petting "seldom," and another 4% reported petting "occasionally." Only two students in the entire sample reported higher frequencies of petting. The same inhibiting factors discussed in relation to necking probably served further to reduce the frequency of petting, so that altogether only 23% of the students surveyed had ever engaged in petting (cf., Table 5). In general, these findings are somewhat similar to those reported by Ehrmann (1959) in his study of dating behavior. Ehrmann reports that greater frequency of dating is directly correlated with frequency of necking and petting. However, incidence of dating, necking, and petting is, of course, considerably greater in Ehrmann's sample. Another important difference between Ehrmann's findings and those of the present study involves incidence of sexual intercourse. Ehrmann indicates 68% of a subsample of single college students had engaged in coitus. Other investigators report similar incidence of coitus among males, though again these researchers have not dealt with atypical groups (eg., Kinsey, 1948; Ross, 1950). In the present sample none of the students surveyed had ever

engaged in sexual intercourse.

Thus, while 54% of the sampled students were dating with varying degrees of frequency at the time of this survey, it is apparent that these dating relationships did not typically involve sexual intimacy. It is questionable as to whether these relationships were characterized by emotional intimacy. Only 34% of the subjects reported ever being in love, and this group includes several students who had never dated. Furthermore, only 10% of the students surveyed had ever "gone steady," while none had ever been engaged. It is not possible to say with complete assurance that seminarian dating relationships are not typically emotionally intimate relationships, but the fact that so few students report typical accompaniments of heterosexual emotional intimacy (such as going steady, being in love, sexual intimacies) suggests that, for the most part, such dating tends to be non-enduring and non-intimate. The implication here is that many seminarians who date do so for social reasons and to enjoy female companionship on a non-intimate level. These data further suggest that seminarians who date are not typically seeking sexual outlets or emotional closeness from female peers. Further evidence to support these contentions will be presented later.

Questionnaire items 18 and 19 were directed toward an assessment of the incidence of autosexual behavior among seminary students. Only 13% of the students surveyed deny ever having engaged in masturbation. Sixty-eight percent of the sample report masturbating either seldom (31%) or occasionally (37%), while 19% report masturbating either frequently or very often.

A parallel relationship between frequency level and incidence holds for sexual fantasies as well, with greatest incidence occurring at middle frequency levels. With one exception, sexual fantasies occur with greater frequency than masturbation at every frequency level (cf., Table 5).

Data from the items concerning autosexual behavior permit an important methodological inference. These data suggest that students are reporting their behavior fairly honestly and with minimal distortion. This seems to be a tenable conclusion since subjects are reporting a morally prohibited behavior with highest incidence at middle and upper frequency levels. If distortion were occurring, one would expect that most students would report masturbating either "never," or "seldom." Furthermore, incidences of masturbating and sexual fantasizing differ from incidence patterns for heterosexual behavior at every frequency level (See Table 5). If most students were actively

TABLE 5

Percentages of Seminary Students Engaging in  
Dating and Forms of Sexual Behavior

Behavior	Never	Seldom	Occasion- ally	Frequently Very Often
Dating Prior to College	44	32	14	10
Dating Currently	46	31	17	7
Necking	69	16	11	4
Petting	77	17	4	2
Sexual Intercourse	100	0	0	0
Masturbation	13	31	37	19
Sexual Fantasies	5	34	42	19

Note.--N=105; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent.

distorting one would expect similar incidence patterns for autosexual and explicit heterosexual behavior.

Comparisons of frequencies of dating behavior and frequencies of autosexual behavior point to several additional conclusions (See Table 6). Contingency coefficients and chi-squares (McNemar, 1962) were computed with the following results. First, there is a highly significant positive correlation between masturbation and sexual fantasy ( $C=.55$ ;  $X^2=45.45$ ;  $p<.05$ ) which is expected. However, there is no significant relationship between current dating frequency and frequency of masturbation ( $X^2=11.49$ ;  $p>.05$ ), nor is there any relationship between current dating frequency and sexual fantasy ( $X^2=7.37$ ;  $p>.05$ ). Consequently, there is no evidence to suggest that dating among seminary students is likely to lead either to increased sexual fantasizing or to masturbation problems. Frequency of dating is not related to sexual fantasies or masturbation, at least insofar as frequency is concerned.

Among the questionnaire items that subjects were requested to answer were several open-end items. In these items subjects were asked to outline their reasons for dating or not dating (Item 5), to state seminary policy toward dating as they understood it (Item 6), and to

TABLE 6

Percentages of Autosexual Behavior Within Each  
Current Dating Frequency Group

Current Dating Frequency	Masturbation Frequency			
	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
Never	15	42	27	17
Seldom	13	16	56	16
Occasionally	17	22	33	28
Frequently Very Often	14	14	43	29

Note.--All figures rounded to nearest whole percent.



indicate the kind of policy they felt would be most beneficial to them (Item 7). Analysis of responses to these open-end items required that all responses be coded or categorized so that they could be expressed in quantitative fashion. Such categorization occasionally produced some overlap in content, but in most cases there were sufficient differences among different groups of responses to warrant inclusion of the various categories separately. In reporting the following data all of the response frequencies have been rounded to the nearest whole percent. Since many subjects included several reasons for dating or not dating in their answers, total percentages will exceed 100. Examples of student responses have been included in reporting the following data in order to clarify the categories and to illustrate what seemed to be frequently occurring sentiment. These examples may be construed as more or less typical responses.

The most frequently given reason for not dating (29%) was that dating is currently forbidden by seminary policy or was forbidden during the subjects' high school years in the seminary. One student, for example, answered simply: "The seminary says no (to dating)." Another replied, I certainly would enjoy it (dating), but do (sic) to school policy and respect for it, I don't (date)." And finally,

a third subject said, "At the time of entrance into the seminary dating was not allowed. When it was allowed, I saw nothing against it, but I saw nothing for it."

As indicated earlier, dating is not completely prohibited by seminary policy; rather, students in this diocesan seminary may date after consultation with a spiritual advisor or psychological counselor. The fact that so many students (29% of the non-daters; 16% of the total sample) offer this as a reason for not dating suggests that seminary policy has not been adequately communicated to a large group of students. This may be due to inadequate understanding of seminary policy on the part of some faculty members, or it may reflect a lack of agreement among the faculty in regard to interpretation of dating policy. Finally, lack of clear understanding of seminary policy on the part of some students may be a consequence of a kind of selective ignorance of the rules in order to avoid any personal responsibility for the decision not to date. There is some support for the latter possibility since the very frequency of dating among classmates would suggest that dating is not totally prohibited, and would make it difficult for any given student to maintain completely accidental ignorance of expressly stated seminary policy.

The suggestion that, at least in some cases, ignorance of seminary policy and a stated belief that dating is forbidden may be employed as convenient rationalizations for not dating receives some support from the fact that several other groups of responses to this item also have a somewhat forced quality. For example, the next most frequent reason (23%) given for not dating was that the student did not feel dating would be enjoyable or that he, personally, felt no need or desire to date. One student wrote, "I do not date because I question just what I hear when those who come back from their dates tell me what a 'great' time they had." There is little doubt of the defensive, rationalizing character of such a statement. Another student indicated that, "To this time I have had no desire or opportunity to do so (date)." Again there is apparent rationalization in this student's statement that he has had no opportunity to date when such opportunity has been available to more than 50% of his classmates whose circumstances are, in many important respects, little different from his own. Still another student replied, "I have never felt the need to meet the opposite sex in a more sufficient manner."

An additional 21% of the non-daters indicated that they believed dating might interfere with their vocational

commitment. Again, some examples may help clarify the thinking of these students. One student wrote, "I feel that one must make a choice. I have made mine, with my goal, the priesthood, as its culmination. One cannot play both sides." Another replied, "I, aspiring to be a priest, must be able to 'get along' without girls. I might as well start now."

A more directly emotional reason for not dating was presented by 23% of the non-daters who indicated, quite candidly, that they did not have sufficient self-confidence to go out with a girl (13%), or that they feared being turned down or not liked, or simply that they were afraid of girls (10%). For example, "I've been too busy studying and I can't really find the time. I'm rather shy--I'd know how to treat a girl if I ever dated, but I just don't have the nerve to ask any." This student began with some rationalization, but then more clearly confronted and expressed his feelings and motivations. Another student replied, "In high school we were strongly encouraged not to date. That with a basic fear of doing something stupid or ridiculous on a date. That is, a fear of being embarrassed (sic) kept me from dating." Again, there is an opening defensive rationalization followed by a more difficult admission. Finally, a third

student replied, "One reason (for not dating) was the seminary policy, second reason, my decision about a vocation, the third reason, I am afraid of girls."

A number of additional miscellaneous reasons or rationalizations for not dating included lack of time, lack of money, lack of a driver's license, not knowing any girls who might be potential dates, and a vaguely stated, "lack of opportunity."

Briefly, the reasons for not dating given by the subjects surveyed included a combination of realistic personal difficulties and vocational obstacles along with a generous mixture of what seem to be selective oversights, excuses, and rationalizations (See Table 7).

Those students who have dated also presented a variety of reasons for doing so, and again realistic goals and motives are mixed with rationalizations.

The most frequently given reason for dating (72%) was, very simply, that dating is an enjoyable experience. One student wrote, "Dating is a good, fun way to spend time, and is an excellent means of expanding and broadening insight into people." Another student replied, "You meet someone you like so you want to spend time with them, to talk, to have fun."

Another frequently given reason for dating (51%) was

TABLE 7

Percentages of Non-Daters Offering  
Various Reasons for Not Dating

Reason for Not Dating	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is forbidden by seminary rules	29
Do not believe dating is enjoyable, no desire to date	23
Dating is not compatible with vocational commitment	21
Lack sufficient self-confidence to date	13
Fear girl will refuse when asked for a date, fear not being liked by date	10
Lack of time	10
Do not know any girls	10
No opportunities to date	4
No driver's license	2
Lack of money	2

Note.--N=48; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent.

that it provides an opportunity to relate with girls. This group of responses is seen as going slightly beyond dating simply because it is enjoyable since it implies some feeling on the part of the subject that an opportunity to relate to female peers on a one-to-one basis is a kind of experience not provided by his environment. For example, "First of all, I enjoy dating and mixing with girls. It gives me an opportunity to relate and converse with them. I feel this is necessary for healthy development." Another student replied, "1) I think I need to see the opposite sex; sometimes we're in this place so long it drives you buggy. 2) As a priest I will need to get along with women, and this is one way." And finally, "I think dating is essential for everyone so they will have some experience of the opposite sex. I think one cannot really know what something is about without being in the situation."

Other reasons for dating included using dating as an escape from problems and a relief from tensions, as an aid in making vocational decisions, as a direct erotic outlet, and as a means of being charitable ("If I like a girl and I want to show her some special kindness, I will ask her out...."). Students' responses to this item are summarized in Table 8. Tables 9 through 11 present more detailed information for the specific dating frequency groups.

TABLE 8

Percentages of All Dating Students Offering  
Various Reasons for Dating

Reason for Dating	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is an enjoyable experience	72
Dating provides an opportunity to relate with girls	51
Dating is useful in attaining better self-definition, self-confidence, insight, and understanding of others	47
Erotic outlet	7
Essential for healthy development	5
Provides an escape from problems, relief from tensions	5
Useful in coming to final decisions concerning vocational commitment	5
Charity	4

Note.--N=57; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent.



TABLE 9

Percentages of Students Dating "Seldom" Offering  
Various Reasons for Dating

Reason for Dating	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is an enjoyable experience	66
Dating provides an opportunity to relate with girls	44
Dating is helpful in attaining better self-definition, self-confidence, insight, and understanding of others	34
Erotic outlet	6
Essential for healthy development	0
Provides an escape from problems, relief from tensions	6
Useful in coming to final decisions concerning vocational commitment	6
Charity	0

Note.--N=32; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent

TABLE 10

Percentages of Students Dating "Occasionally" Offering  
Various Reasons for Dating

Reason for Dating	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is an enjoyable experience	78
Dating provides an opportunity to relate with girls	67
Dating is helpful in attaining better self-definition, self-confidence, insight, and understanding of others	44
Erotic outlet	6
Essential for healthy development	12
Provides an escape from problems, relief from tensions	6
Useful in coming to final decisions concerning vocational commitment	6
Charity	6

Note.--N=18; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent

TABLE 11

Percentages of Students Dating "Frequently" and  
"Very Often" Offering Various Reasons for Dating

Reason for Dating	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is an enjoyable experience	43
Dating provides an opportunity to relate with girls	29
Dating is helpful in attaining better self-definition, self-confidence, insight, and understanding of others	29
Erotic outlet	14
Essential for healthy development	14
Provides an escape from problems, relief from tensions	0
Useful in coming to final decisions concerning vocational commitment	0
Charity	14

Note.--N=7; all figures rounded to nearest whole percent.

Examination of Tables 8 through 11 suggests that acknowledged motivations for dating are in most cases fairly realistic and mature. In relatively few cases do students employ dating exploitatively for erotic stimulation or as a means of avoiding problem situations, or for self-aggrandizement.

In questionnaire item number six, students were asked to describe seminary policy in regard to dating. Responses to this item were again categorized and tabulated with a view to determining the extent to which seminary policy has been clearly communicated to the student body. Of the students surveyed, 68.6% seem to understand quite clearly that the seminary faculty has developed a policy wherein individual, one-to-one dating is permissible provided the student has consulted with his spiritual director or psychological counselor concerning his intentions. This policy was apparently developed in an attempt to allow students to date who seem to require the experience for their own personal development or who experience some conflict concerning vocational commitment and therefore could benefit from experiences which might clarify their own needs and goals. While a majority of the students (68.6%) clearly understand this policy, only 28.6% agree that it is useful or beneficial to them. Furthermore, of this subgroup of 28.6%, 37% approve of

seminary policy because they view it as highly permissive when compared to previous seminary rules (typically at the high school level) concerning dating.

Returning to the original question of student understanding of administrative policy regarding dating, 8.5% of the students surveyed perceived the seminary as actively discouraging dating without directly prohibiting it. An additional 5.7% viewed dating as simply tolerated on the part of the administration without direct attempts at developing a regulatory policy. Five students (4.8%) felt that dating was directly prohibited or that only mixers or social gatherings were permitted.

It is interesting to note here that while 16% of the students indicated that they did not date because dating is prohibited by seminary policy, only 5% indicate that seminary policy is directly and completely prohibitive regarding dating. This discrepancy lends additional credence to the suggestion made earlier that many students may selectively ignore or overlook or distort seminary policy in order to relieve themselves of the responsibility of a personal decision to date or not to date.

Returning again to the question of student understanding of seminary policy, 7.6% of the students felt that dating is a matter of individual discretion. No responses or

unclassifiable responses were given by 4.8% of the sample. Responses to this item are summarized in Table 12.

While only a small percentage of the students believed that seminary policy regards dating as a purely personal decision, 48.6% believe that this is what seminary policy, ideally, should be. A more restrictive seminary policy was advocated by 9.5% of the subjects who suggested that dating should be expressly and completely forbidden or, at most, only tolerated in a seminary environment. As previously reported, 37.1% of the students feel that current seminary policy is adequate and would not advocate any major changes in policy. Five percent of the sample gave no response to this item or were undecided as to what the most effective seminary policy regarding dating might be. Responses to this item are summarized in Table 13.

A final free-response item asked the subjects to estimate the effect of seminary policy regarding dating on their own personal development. Approximately 29% of the students believed that seminary policy--and particularly the more restrictive policy of the high school seminary--had interfered with their personal development. Typically, students expressing such sentiments felt that current lack of ease or facility in social situations was

TABLE 12

## Students' Conceptions of Seminary Dating Policy

Student Conception of Dating Policy	Percentage of Respondents
Dating is permitted after consultation with a spiritual director or psychological counselor	68.6
Dating is actively discouraged by seminary faculty but is not expressly prohibited	8.5
Dating is tolerated but not encouraged	5.7
Dating is expressly prohibited; students may only attend mixers or semi-social group activities	4.8
Dating is a matter of individual discretion	7.6
No response; unclassifiable response	4.8

Note.--N=105

TABLE 13

## Students' Conceptions of Ideal Seminary Dating Policy

Ideal Seminary Dating Policy	Percentage of Respondents
The seminary should permit dating after consultation with a spiritual director or psychological counselor (current policy)	37.1
The decision to date or not to date should be a matter of individual discretion	48.6
Dating should be expressly prohibited or only tolerated in the seminary	9.5
No response; unclassifiable response	4.8

Note.--N=105



due largely to earlier restrictions on such activities. These students felt that they had been deprived of opportunities to learn how to relate to female peers.

At the opposite extreme, 21.9% of the students surveyed felt that seminary policy had contributed to their development. It should be noted, however, that 11 members of this subgroup, or 37%, felt that seminary policy had fostered personal development because they interpreted the question as referring specifically to current seminary policy as compared to earlier policy, the latter having been more restrictive. Consequently, these students felt that they had been helped by seminary policy because it permitted them to date without undue difficulty or a necessity for secrecy.

Thirty-five percent of the subjects felt that seminary policy had neither contributed to nor interfered with their development. Within this subgroup it was not uncommon to find a student responding that seminary policy regarding dating had little effect on him simply because he ignored whatever policy had been formulated or communicated. Some students (7.6%) felt that they could not estimate the effects of seminary dating regulations on their development, and others (1.9%) felt that the effects of school regulations were mixed as far as their

own development was concerned. Five percent of the respondents gave no response to this item. Response frequencies are summarized in Table 14.

Questionnaire items 10 and 11 were directed toward attaining an estimate of subjects' sex-role identification. It is reasonable to expect that sex-role identification might bear some relationship to dating behavior, though the specific nature of this relationship could conceivably take several forms. For example, one might suppose that males identifying more closely with their fathers would adopt more typically masculine types of behavior. In our culture dating is one such type of behavior. By contrast, one might also reasonably expect that males identifying with certain maternal characteristics would be able more easily to relate to female peers or to have a more positive concept of females generally.

However, analysis of responses to items 10 and 11 (respectively, "To which parent do you feel closer?" "Are your attitudes and opinions generally more similar to those of your mother or father?") in conjunction with subjects' current dating frequency revealed no relationship whatever ( $\chi^2=.937$  for item 10,  $p>.05$ ;  $\chi^2=1.381$  for item 11,  $p>.05$ ).

TABLE 14

Students' Estimations of Effects of Seminary Policy  
on Their Development

Estimated Effect of Seminary Dating Policy on Development of Student	Percentage of Respondents
Seminary dating policy has contributed to personal development	21.9
Seminary policy has interfered with personal development	28.6
Seminary policy has neither contributed to nor interfered with development	35.2
Seminary policy has had mixed effects on development	1.9
Undecided	7.6
No response; unclassifiable response	4.8

Note.--N=105.

### C. The Personality Instruments: MMPI, EPPS, Semantic Differential

As indicated earlier, this study has two major goals: the collection of descriptive data concerning the actual heterosexual behavior of students studying for the priesthood, and the exploration of possible relationships between this behavior and personality development and adequacy. Data from the questionnaire administered to all subjects were directed toward the first goal. Data from the MMPI, EPPS, and the semantic differential are directed toward the latter goal.

In analyzing student responses to the various personality instruments, the initial step was a categorization of the sample into four groups on the basis of current dating frequency. The four groups resulting from this categorization include students dating "Never" (N=48), "Seldom" (N=32), "Occasionally" (N=18), "Frequently" and "Very Often" (N=7). As indicated previously, the use of current dating frequency as a criterion variable is tenable since responses to this item serve as the best index of overall heterosexual behavior (cf., p.29 and Table 1).

With students separated into these four dating frequency categories, means and standard deviations were computed for each group on the 10 standard clinical scales of the MMPI plus the MMPI K-scale and the mean of the

10 clinical scales. These statistics were also computed for each group on six selected EPPS scales (Autonomy, Affiliation, Succorance, Nurturance, Heterosexuality, and Aggression). These data are summarized in Tables 15 and 16.

Examination of these means and standard deviations does not prove particularly revealing since there are no immediately striking differences among the groups on the different variables.

Using the dating frequency groups as "organismic variables" analogous to treatment variables (Edwards, 1950) one-way analyses of variance were conducted on the MMPI scales and the EPPS scales. A computational formula was employed for unequal N's with means weighted proportionally to their representation (Winer, 1962). A decision was made to employ a weighted means formula since there was no basis for assuming that the various groups would be equally represented in a total population as might be the case when unequal N's result from subject attrition in an investigation of experimental treatment effects. In this study unequal N's did not result from attrition and probably represent inequalities in dating frequency in the population of seminarians from which this sample was drawn. In such a case Winer (1962, pp. 96ff., 222ff.,

TABLE 15

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of  
Current Dating Frequency Groups on Selected MMPI Scales

MMPI Scale		Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
K	Mean	54.7	58.1	57.1	54.7
	SD	8.49	8.83	11.26	8.25
Hs	Mean	52.3	53.1	52.9	52.0
	SD	9.99	6.54	11.01	4.78
D	Mean	56.9	51.9	61.5	55.7
	SD	11.22	7.60	12.15	8.08
Hy	Mean	56.4	57.6	58.4	57.1
	SD	9.82	8.01	7.16	7.64
Pd	Mean	55.1	57.9	61.3	54.3
	SD	10.33	8.43	13.07	13.08
Mf	Mean	62.5	61.9	59.9	66.7
	SD	10.63	8.79	14.42	3.76
Pa	Mean	55.7	57.5	55.3	53.7
	SD	10.89	7.46	9.12	8.90
Pt	Mean	59.0	60.2	64.9	58.9
	SD	10.93	10.52	12.13	8.88
Sc	Mean	58.0	60.5	62.2	57.6
	SD	10.69	7.13	14.02	7.40
Ma	Mean	52.8	58.3	54.2	55.0
	SD	8.61	8.45	9.34	6.34

TABLE 15, cont.

MMPI Scale		Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
Si	Mean	54.4	49.4	54.4	54.7
	SD	9.61	7.42	11.40	8.66
Mean	Mean	56.1	56.9	58.8	57.3
	SD	7.46	4.67	6.62	4.72

TABLE 16

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of  
Current Dating Frequency Groups on Selected EPPS Scales

EPPS Scale		Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
Autonomy	Mean	13.54	13.56	14.05	13.14
	SD	3.44	3.57	3.42	3.68
Affilia- tion	Mean	15.81	16.65	16.83	17.00
	SD	3.86	4.66	5.35	2.78
Succor- rance	Mean	12.75	12.21	12.33	14.42
	SD	4.39	3.49	3.67	5.70
Nurtur- ance	Mean	16.79	17.15	16.88	16.71
	SD	4.27	4.45	4.14	2.43
Hetero- sexuality	Mean	12.25	14.43	14.55	16.28
	SD	7.00	5.23	5.28	5.72
Aggres- sion	Mean	12.81	12.90	12.66	11.57
	SD	4.54	4.43	4.27	2.44



374ff.) suggests the use of a weighted means analysis of variance. Summaries of these analyses are presented in Appendix III.

Of the 18 analyses conducted in this fashion only one (MMPI D-scale) proved significant beyond the .05 level of probability. There were no significant differences among the means of the dating frequency groups on any of the other 17 scales subjected to analysis. At this point the question arises as to whether the single significant analysis can be taken seriously since, at the five percent level of probability, one would expect one out of twenty analyses to be significant simply by chance. Obviously, there is no absolute way of answering this question. However, explanation of what may be a chance difference would be gratuitous. Until replication either substantiates or contradicts the existence of such a difference it will be treated as a chance significance.

In summary, the results of 18 analyses of variance conducted on scores on the MMPI and EPPS yielded no significant differences among the dating frequency groups. The results of these analyses do not permit inferences concerning dating frequency as a relevant variable leading to significant differences in adjustment adequacy as measured by the MMPI and EPPS.

Subsequent to these analyses of variance, Spearman rank correlation coefficients were computed between current dating frequency and the various MMPI and EPPS personality variables. It had been specifically hypothesized (cf., p. 26) that a negative correlation would exist between current dating frequency and the mean of subjects' scores on the 10 MMPI clinical scales. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that subjects who dated more frequently would exhibit more adequate personality adjustment (eg., Schneiders, 1960; Cole and Hall, 1965). This hypothesis did not receive empirical support and consequently must be rejected (See Table 17).

In fact, very few correlations appeared between heterosexual behavior (including current dating frequency) and any of the MMPI and EPPS variables. Only one of this series of correlations is worth further discussion, that between the EPPS heterosexuality scale and dating frequency. Heterosexuality is significantly correlated with current dating frequency and with all other categories of actual heterosexual behavior except sexual intercourse (Sexual intercourse is not included as a variable in the correlational analyses since no student had ever engaged in coitus). This correlational finding has two implications of importance. First, it suggests that the EPPS

TABLE 17

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Heterosexual  
Behavior and MMPI Scales

MMPI Scale	Heterosexual Behavior			
	Dating Prior to College	Current Dating	Necking	Petting
K	.13	.07	-.02	.15
Hs	.05	-.01	.08	.09
D	-.23*	-.04	-.13	-.18
Hy	.09	.05	.08	.10
Pd	.15	.18	.15	.17
Mf	-.02	.01	.02	-.04
Pa	.02	-.07	.10	.03
Pt	.06	.11	.12	.07
Sc	.15	.18	.15	.11
Ma	.20*	.12	.18	.08
Si	-.28*	-.07	-.15	-.19
Mean	-.02	.09	.06	.03

\* $p < .05$

TABLE 18

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Heterosexual  
Behavior and EPPS Scales

EPPS Scale	Heterosexual Behavior			
	Dating Prior to College	Current Dating	Necking	Petting
Autonomy	.07	.06	.10	.09
Affiliation	.05	.08	-.08	-.08
Succorance	-.06	-.06	-.05	-.09
Nurturance	-.06	-.03	-.13	-.11
Heterosex- uality	.34*	.24*	.28*	.23*
Aggression	.06	.03	.03	.02

\* $p < .05$

heterosexuality scale is validly assessing an acknowledged need, and therefore contributes some evidence in support of the construct validity of this EPPS scale. Second, the correlation between heterosexual behavior and the EPPS heterosexuality scale indicates that the criterion variable (current dating frequency) and the remaining behavioral variables (prior dating, necking, petting) are sufficiently sensitive to reflect behavioral differences among the sample students. That is, this correlational finding indicates that when salient personality differences do exist among the subjects, the behavioral variables and the classification categories (Never, Seldom, Occasionally, Frequently and Very Often) are sufficiently discriminative to reflect these differences. By extension, one may also infer--though more speculatively--that in those cases where no significant relationships emerged between personality characteristics and dating behavior, none exist in fact.

Briefly stated, the reasoning here is that when salient relationships exist, these relationships emerge in the data. The lack of significant relationships for many of the personality variables probably indicates that such variables are not importantly related to dating behavior.

Summarizing the results of these correlational analyses,

only 7 of over 70 coefficients of correlation reached statistical significance. Of these 7 significant correlations, only those between heterosexual behavior and the EPPS heterosexuality scale are of sufficient magnitude and consistency to warrant any inferences.

At this point all that can be said is that no general statements can be made to the effect that dating behavior is significantly related to adjustment adequacy or to most of the individual personality variables assessed in this study.

In previous discussions of the MMPI it has been pointed out that, although this instrument is invaluable for purposes of differentiating subjects in terms of overall adequacy of adjustment, it might not be sufficiently sensitive to real differences among an essentially normal population (cf., pp. 10-13). It was for this reason that a decision was made to employ a supplementary personality assessment instrument, the semantic differential.

Two hypotheses have been developed involving the semantic differential. First, it was hypothesized that seminarians differing in frequency of dating would exhibit differences in self-acceptance. A second hypothesis stated that seminarians differing in frequency of dating would exhibit differences in sex-role identification (pp. 25-26).

In order to test these hypotheses "D" scores (Osgood, et.al., 1957) were computed for each subject between semantic differential ratings of the concepts, "Me" and "Myself as I Would Like to Be," and between the concepts, "Me" and "Man." This procedure yielded two sets of "D" scores for each group of subjects. The former "D" scores constituted an index of the discrepancy between self-as-perceived and ideal self, and the latter "D" scores provided an index of the discrepancy between self-as-perceived and the idealized concept, "Man." Briefly, these computations yield measures of self-acceptance and sex-role identification.

These "D" Scores were then subjected to a Kruskal-Wallace one-way analysis of variance (Siegel, 1956) with current dating frequency categories serving as an independent organismic variable (Edwards, 1950). It was necessary to employ the Kruskal-Wallace test since the distribution of "D" is unknown and probably not normal (Osgood, et.al., 1957). Though the Kruskal-Wallace test is described by Siegel as an extremely powerful procedure or technique (Siegel, 1956), it is not widely used. Consequently, the procedure used in the computation of "H," the statistic yielded by the Kruskal-Wallace analysis, will be outlined here.

Initially, the entire array of "D" scores for all subjects was ranked from lowest to highest. Tied ranks were averaged, with each rank involved in the tie receiving the average rank of the tied scores. Subsequently, scores were replaced by ranks and then returned to their original dating frequency categories. Following this step, "H" was computed and a correction for ties was applied. Ranks for the various dating frequency groups for both analyses are presented in Tables 19 and 20.

In the first analysis of "D" scores between the concepts, "Me" and "Myself as I Would Like to Be," a highly significant difference among the dating frequency groups emerged ( $H=14.13$ ;  $df=3$ ;  $p<.01$ ), supporting the stated hypothesis. Subjects in the different dating frequency groups do differ in the degree of self-acceptance they manifest. Examination of the mean ranks for the various dating frequency groups (Table 19) reveals the source of the primary difference. Those subjects who are not dating at all (dating frequency group, "Never") have a mean "D" score rank of 64.81 which is 16.54 higher than the next highest mean rank.

It is clear that those students who do not date are significantly less self-acceptant than those student who do date to one extent or another. The implication is



that students who do not date experience difficulties in self-acceptance and, by inference, some difficulties in personality adequacy, though probably at a subclinical level (since similar problems do not appear on the MMPI). It is not possible to say whether difficulties in self-acceptance produce or are consequent upon a lack of heterosexual activity, but it is likely that the relationship is circular, with each variable contributing to the intensification of the other. Statements concerning cause-effect relationships in this case would require longitudinal investigation.

Returning to the second hypothesis, that concerning sex-role identification, there is no significant difference among the various dating frequency groups ( $H=5.03$ ;  $df=3$ ;  $p>.05$ ). There is no significant relationship between sex-role identification as measured by the semantic differential and current dating frequency.

Results of these analyses of data from the Bardis Dating Scale, the questionnaire, and the various personality assessment instruments permit several conclusions.

1. Data from the administration of the Dating Scale indicate that there is no direct relationship between attitudes of permissiveness and liberality in regard to dating and heterosexual behavior and actual behavior.

TABLE 19

"D" Score Ranks Between the Concepts "Me" and "Myself as I  
Would Like to Be" for Current Dating Frequency Groups

Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
3.0	3.0	90.5	36.0
82.5	60.5	8.0	52.5
17.0	52.5	78.5	45.5
62.0	8.0	75.5	8.0
85.0	26.0	63.5	77.0
101.0	75.5	8.0	21.5
40.0	30.5	52.5	57.0
87.5	17.0	80.5	
50.0	26.0	87.5	
73.5	69.5	3.0	
90.5	57.0	8.0	
45.5	30.5	45.5	
3.0	78.5	21.5	
45.5	40.0	3.0	
65.5	21.5	98.0	
96.0	21.5	95.0	
93.5	67.0	38.0	
102.0	73.5	12.5	
36.0	57.0		
45.5	72.0		
63.5	84.0		
33.5	65.5		
45.5	17.0		
80.5	14.0		
69.5	17.0		
57.0	11.0		
97.0	17.0		
40.0	60.5		
100.0	26.0		
45.5	12.5		

TABLE 19, cont.

Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
104.0			
30.5	45.5		
26.0	30.5		
93.5			
57.0			
89.0			
82.5			
69.5			
99.0			
36.0			
69.5			
26.0			
92.0			
103.0			
33.5			
86.0			
52.5			
64.8	40.2	48.3	42.5

Note.--Figures in final row indicate average ranks.

TABLE 20

"D" Score Ranks Between the Concepts "Me" and "Man"  
for Current Dating Frequency Groups

Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
82.0	87.0	74.0	12.5
85.0	92.0	105.0	38.0
101.0	22.5	31.5	72.0
22.5	4.0	48.0	26.5
67.0	57.0	4.0	42.5
94.0	61.0	4.0	42.5
26.5	59.0	17.5	55.0
48.0	99.5	81.0	
80.0	12.5	31.5	
94.0	17.5	8.0	
76.0	26.5	52.0	
62.5	17.5	67.0	
4.0	31.5	77.5	
12.5	48.0	64.0	
91.0	17.5	99.5	
83.0	9.5	89.0	
88.0	70.0	103.0	
94.0	35.0	74.0	
59.0	42.5		
38.0	102.0		
22.5	71.0		
55.0	74.0		
17.5	84.0		
4.0	12.5		
90.0	31.5		
98.0	38.0		
67.0	7.5		
31.5	4.0		
38.0	17.5		

TABLE 20, cont.

Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently Very Often
42.5	62.5		
42.5			
31.5			
104.0			
4.0			
55.0			
67.0			
52.0			
97.0			
86.0			
26.5			
79.0			
67.0			
96.0			
48.0			
22.5			
48.0			
57.9	46.7	57.2	36.6

Note.--Figures in final row indicate average ranks.

students who express more permissive attitudes do not necessarily exhibit behavior corresponding to these attitudes. More conservative students do not consistently behave conservatively with regard to female peers.

2. The results of this study do not support notions of extreme restriction of heterosexual behavior among seminarians. More than half the students surveyed have dated at one time or another, and nearly 25% date with some frequency. Furthermore, nearly one-fourth of the students in this sample have engaged in explicitly sexual behavior including necking and petting, though none of the respondents admitted to having had sexual intercourse. On the basis of these findings it is clear that seminary students do not avoid problems of relating to females simply by entering the seminary. The student in the diocesan seminary is, typically, dealing with questions regarding his role in heterosexual relationships, and there is sufficient latitude in the behavior of his classmates so that several alternative options are available to him within the seminary environment. Any given student may or may not date, but this is no longer simply a consequence of entrance into the seminary. Rather, many students have come to individual decisions regarding relationships with young women, and this freedom

brings with it the possibility of indecision and personal conflict. The frequency of dating within the seminary additionally suggests that the non-dating seminary student, like his non-dating peers outside the seminary, may occasionally question his own adequacy and social acceptability in view of the fact that he is not engaging in a type of behavior which is accepted, perhaps even expected, by his peers (Cameron and Kenkel, 1960). Dating raises problems even for those students who do not date.

3. Autosexual behavior in the form of masturbation and sexual fantasy occur among seminarians with even greater frequency than heterosexual behavior. Obviously, such behavior is less demanding of personal initiative and aggressiveness on the part of the individual and, for the seminarian, avoids some of the external problems involving seminary regulations, though the potentials for conflict and guilt are nevertheless present.

A rather important conclusion derived from analysis of incidence of heterosexual and autosexual behavior should be emphasized. There is no relationship between frequency of dating and frequency of masturbation or sexual fantasizing. Consequently, the argument occasionally encountered that one-to-one heterosexual contacts will increase the incidence of autosexual behavior among

seminarians is not tenable and, in fact, is contradicted by empirical data. Dating does not create or intensify masturbation problems.

4. When asked to report their reasons for engaging in or refraining from dating, seminarians offer a variety of diverse reasons. Non-daters explain that they do not date because dating is forbidden (which is not completely accurate), because they do not believe dating is enjoyable, because they have no desire to date, because dating might interfere with vocational commitments, or because of shyness, lack of self-confidence, lack of money, and lack of time. Qualitative examination of the reasons offered for not dating suggests that often these explanations are forced and artificial, rationalizations rather than explanations (cf., p. 43). Why should the non-dater find it necessary to rationalize in such fashion? The answer may be that he experiences himself as atypical insofar as heterosexual relationships are concerned and thus needs to account for discrepancies between his behavior and the behavior of many of his classmates (cf., p. 76; also, Cameron and Kenkel, 1960).

Those students who do date indicate that they do so because dating is an enjoyable experience, because it provides an opportunity to learn how to relate to and



better understand female peers, because dating provides an escape from seminary routine, and because dating provides an erotic outlet. While it is evident that some of these reasons for dating are somewhat cynical and exploitative, the majority of students who date do not use the situation as an opportunity for sexual exploitation or status enhancement. Most seminarians who date indicate that they do so because dating provides opportunities for mutual growth, enjoyment, companionship, and the development of interpersonal ease and understanding.

5. Questionnaire data indicate that nearly 70% of the respondents have a clear and adequate understanding of seminary policy concerning dating. This also means that almost a third of the students do not have a clear conception of formal seminary dating policy. There are several possible explanations for the fact that so many students are unable correctly to outline seminary dating regulations. First, students' mistaken notions may reflect mistaken ideas of their spiritual directors or psychological counselors. It is also possible that student misunderstanding is a consequence of consultation with individual faculty members who disapprove or administrative policy and who impart their own notions of appropriate seminarian behavior. Finally, it is

possible that student misunderstanding of seminary policy results from selective inattention to administrative statements regarding dating. Repeated attempts at clarification of seminary policy would help to eliminate mistaken notions of students and faculty and would make any kind of selective ignorance more difficult. Repeated statements of policy and continual clarification would provide an atmosphere more conducive to personal growth and mutual discussion than do misunderstanding, disagreement, and denial.

6. Student appraisals of seminary policy on dating are mixed. More than a fourth of the respondents believe that seminary policy, and especially the more restrictive policy at the high school level, have interfered with personal development by depriving them of opportunities to learn to relate to female peers easily and comfortably. Another 22% of the students feel that they have benefited from seminary policy on dating, but it should be noted that many of these students approve of seminary policy because they view it as highly permissive when compared to previous policy at the high school level. The largest group of respondents (35%) indicated that seminary policy has had little effect on their development, in many cases because administrative policy has simply been ignored.

7. Exploration of the relationships between dating behavior and personality variables yielded few clearcut results. The only reliable finding involved a consistent and significant correlation between the EPPS heterosexuality scale and heterosexual behavior. The existence of these relationships provides some evidence of construct validity for the heterosexuality scale. More importantly, it suggests that the research methods employed have detected salient differences when these differences exist in the subjects.

Correlational analyses failed to provide evidence for a hypothesized negative correlation between dating frequency and mean elevation of the 10 MMPI clinical scales ( $\rho = -.09$ ;  $p > .05$ ). The lack of meaningful correlations between any individual MMPI scales and dating frequency indicates that employment of the mean has not obscured possible relationships. Rather, such correlations do not exist in sufficient degree to be reflected in the measures used here.

8. A highly significant difference in self-acceptance was found among the dating frequency groups. Examination of the mean ranks for the different dating frequency groups indicates that greatest difficulties in self-acceptance occur among non-daters. Since analogous differences among the dating frequency groups were not

found in analyses conducted on individual and mean MMPI scores, the implication is that these difficulties in self-acceptance exist at a subclinical level. That is, self-acceptance difficulties among non-daters are not of a seriously pathological nature. In fact, it may be that such self-acceptance difficulties reflect concerns on the part of some students about being atypical or about behaving differently from many of their classmates (cf., pp. 75-76). It is also likely that individuals who lack self-esteem for a variety of reasons do not have sufficient self-confidence to initiate dating relationships, and the lack of successful heterosexual experiences further contributes to dissatisfaction with self. More thorough understanding of the nature and causes of self-acceptance difficulties among many non-daters requires further investigation.

9. No evidence was found to support a hypothesized difference in sex-role identification among the different dating frequency groups.

10. In addition to these substantive conclusions, several points may be made concerning methodological considerations. First, extensive data on the personal history of each subjects would be useful in developing explanatory conceptions concerning reasons for dating or not dating.

While subjects presented acknowledged or conscious reasons for dating or not dating, thorough anamnestic information would permit more substantial conclusions regarding motivation.

Though the MMPI and EPPS may be useful as initial screening devices to differentiate students into broad classes, their utility rapidly decreases as a population become more homogeneous in terms of adjustment adequacy. Further, both of these instruments may reflect social desirability sets and, possibly, dissimulation on the part of some subjects. The semantic differential proved more useful in providing finer discriminations among an essentially normal population. The semantic differential also provides opportunities for the researcher to gather ipsative data as a supplement to information from more traditional instruments. Q-sorts have many of the advantages of the semantic differential (flexibility, ipsative data, capacity for discriminating among normal subjects) and, in addition, may be more amenable to a greater variety of statistical treatments. Inclusion of at least a "self" and "ideal self" Q-sort in subsequent studies might prove useful.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

The central objective of this study was to gather descriptive information concerning the dating activity and heterosexual behavior of seminary students, and to explore possible relationships between such behavior and personality adequacy. With these goals in mind several hypotheses were developed to serve as heuristic tools in the organization and analysis of the data.

1. It was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between frequency of dating and adequacy of adjustment.
2. It was hypothesized that students differing in dating frequency would exhibit differences in self-acceptance.
3. It was hypothesized that students differing in dating frequency would exhibit differences in sex-role identification.

The sample consisted of 105 college freshmen in a large, metropolitan, diocesan seminary. Prior to beginning college, all students had completed the MMPI and the EPPS.

At the end of the freshman year students completed a second battery of assessment instruments including a questionnaire on dating and sexual behavior, an attitude scale assessing liberality of attitudes toward dating, and a standard form of the semantic differential in which subjects rated a series of concepts on 10 bipolar adjective scales.

Analysis of questionnaire data indicated that more than 50% of the students surveyed were dating at the time of the study with only 46% of the sample indicating that they were not dating at all. Students differed in frequency of dating, with fewer students dating at the higher frequency levels. Analyses of student responses to the dating permissiveness scale in conjunction with dating frequency indicated that there was no direct relationship between frequency of dating and liberality of attitudes toward dating.

Analysis of personality data (MMPI, EPPS) in conjunction with dating frequency did not reveal any significant differences in personality adequacy as a function of dating frequency. Of a series of 18 analyses of variance, only one was significant beyond the .05 level of probability: that between the EPPS heterosexuality scale and dating frequency. A hypothesized relationship between dating

frequency and adjustment adequacy had to be rejected.

Analyses of semantic differential self-ideal self ratings produced a highly significant difference among the dating frequency groups, with non-daters exhibiting greatest difficulties in self-acceptance. An analysis of semantic differential ratings of discrepancies between the concepts, "Me" and "Man" was not significant, and a hypothesized relationship between dating frequency and sex-role identification was rejected.

Various additional analyses of questionnaire data led to the following conclusions:

1. Autosexual behaviors in the form of masturbation and sexual fantasy are more common among seminarians than heterosexual behavior. However, there is no relationship between frequency of dating and frequency of masturbation or sexual fantasizing.
2. Seminarians who date do so for a variety of reasons, the most common of which are that dating is an enjoyable experience and that dating provides opportunities for learning to relate to females. Seminarians who date do not typically do so for exploitative reasons or for status enhancement. Non-daters refrain from dating ostensibly because of seminary regulations, because they do not believe dating is enjoyable, or because they



lack self-confidence.

3. The majority of students in this seminary have an adequate understanding of seminary dating policy, but a substantial proportion (nearly 30%) have misconceptions concerning school dating regulations.

4. Student appraisals of the effects of seminary dating policy on personal development are mixed. More than 25% of the subjects feel that seminary policy has had a deleterious effect on their development, while 22% feel that seminary policy has had beneficial effects on personal development. Thirty-five percent of the students surveyed indicated that seminary policy has had little effect on them either positively or negatively.

## ABSTRACT

Freshman college students studying for the priesthood in a large, diocesan seminary completed a dating behavior questionnaire and a series of personality assessment instruments including the MMPI and EPPS. Hypothesized relationships between dating frequency and adjustment adequacy, and between dating frequency and sex-role identification were not supported by the data. However, a third hypothesized relationship between dating frequency and self-acceptance was accepted ( $p < .01$ ). Analyses of questionnaire data were also reported, and the implications of these analyses were discussed.

## REFERENCES

- Adcock, C. J. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In O. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements year-book. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Bardis, P. T. Attitudes toward dating among the students of a Michigan high school. Sociology and Social Research, 1958, 42, 274-277.
- Bardis, P. T. A dating scale: A technique for the quantitative measurement of liberalism concerning selected aspects of dating. Social Science, 1962, 47, 44-47.
- Beigel, H. G. Abstinence. In A. Ellis & A. Abarbanel (Eds.), Encyclopedia of sexual behavior. New York: Hawthorn, 1961.
- Bell, R. R., & Blumberg, D. Courtship intimacy and religious background. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 356-360.
- Berger, E. M. The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Bier, W. C. A comparative study of a seminary group and four other groups on the M.M.P.I. Washington, D.C. Catholic University Press, 1948.
- Bier, W. C. A comparative study of five Catholic college groups on the MMPI. In G. S. Welsh & W. G. Dahlstrom (Eds.), Basic readings on the MMPI in psychology and medicine. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956, 589-609.
- Block, J., & Thomas, H. Is satisfaction with self a measure of adjustment? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 254-259.

- Blood, R. O. A retest of Waller's rating complex. Marriage and Family Living, 1955, 18, 41-47.
- Breed, W. Sex, class, and socialization in dating. Marriage and Family Living, 1956, 18, 137-147.
- Brim, O. G. Adolescent personality as self-other systems. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 156-162.
- Broderick, C. B., & Fowler, S.E. New patterns of relationships between the sexes among preadolescents. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 27-30.
- Broderick, C. B. Social heterosexual development among urban Negroes and Whites. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 200-203.
- Brown, D. G. Sex role development in a changing culture. Psychological Bulletin, 1958, 55, 232-242.
- Brown, R. Is a boulder sweet or sour? Contemporary Psychology, 1958, 3, 113-115.
- Cameron, W. J., & Kenkel, W. F. High school dating: A study in variation. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 57, 580-586.
- Carroll, J. B. Review of the measurement of meaning. In J. G. Snider & C. E. Osgood (Eds.), Semantic differential technique. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- Chase, P. H. Self-concepts in adjusted and maladjusted patients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 495-497.
- Christenson, H. T. Dating behavior as evaluated by high school students. American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 57, 580-586.
- Cliff, N. Adverbs as multipliers. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 27-44.
- Cole, L., & Hall, T. Psychology of adolescence. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. Assessing similarity

between profiles. Psychological Bulletin, 1953, 50, 456-473.

- Deese, J. The associative structure of some common English adjectives. Journal of Learning and Verbal Behavior,
- Dunn, R. F. Personality patterns among religious personnel: A review. Catholic Psychological Record, 1965, 3, 125-137.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Rinehart, 1950.
- Edwards, A.L. Manual for the personal preference schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Edwards, A. L. Social desirability and performance on the MMPI. Psychometrika, 1964, 29, 295-308.
- Ehrmann, W. W. Premarital dating behavior. New York: Bantam, 1960.
- Ehrmann, W. W. Student cooperation in a study of dating behavior. Marriage and Family Living, 1952, 14, 322-326.
- Ellis, A., & Abarbanel, A. (Eds.) Encyclopedia of sexual behavior. New York: Hawthorn, 1961.
- Endler, N. S. Changes in meaning during psychotherapy as measured by the semantic differential. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 105-111.
- Fiedler, F. E., Hutchins, E. B., & Dodge, J. S. Quasi-therapeutic relations in small college and military groups. Psychological Monographs, 1959, 73, 1-28.
- Fleege, U. H. Self-revelation of the adolescent boy. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1945.
- Ford, L. H., & Meisels, M. Social desirability and the semantic differential. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1965, 24, 465-475.
- Friedman, C. J., & Gladden, J. W. Objective measurement of social role concepts via the semantic differential. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 239-247.

- Glossberg, G. Y. Sexual behavior patterns in contemporary youth culture: Implications for later marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 190-192.
- Gorman, J. R. Adjustment and interests of fourth year minor seminarians studying for the diocesan priesthood. Unpublished master's thesis, Loyola University, 1961.
- Griggs, A. E. A validity study of the semantic differential technique. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 179-181.
- Griggs, A. E. A validity test of self-ideal discrepancy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 311-313.
- Hagmaier, G., & Kennedy, E. C. Psychological aspects of seminary education. In J. M. Lee & L. J. Putz (Eds.), Seminary education in a time of change. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965.
- Healy, T. I. A comparative study of certain personality and vocational interest variables of seminarians who completed and failed to complete a junior college program. Unpublished master's thesis, Loyola University, 1968.
- Heilbrun, A. B. Conformity to masculinity-femininity stereotypes and ego-identity in adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 351-357.
- Heise, D. R. Semantic differential profiles of 1,000 most frequent English words. Psychological Monographs, 1965, 79, (Whole No. 8).
- Hurlock, E. B. Adolescent development. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Insko, C. A. Theories of attitude change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Jervis, F. M. The meaning of a positive self-concept. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 370-373.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948.

- Kobler, F. J., Rizzo, J. V., & Doyle, E. Dating and the formation of the religious. Journal of Religion and Health, 1967, 6, 137-147.
- Landis, P. H. Sex in development. New York: Harper, 1940.
- Lingoes, J. C. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In O. Buros (Ed.), Sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Lucas, C. M., & Horrock, J. E. An experimental approach to the analysis of adolescent needs. Child Development, 1960, 31, 479-487.
- McCarthy, C. The growing seminary dating game. National Catholic Reporter, 1968, v.4, no. 38, p. 1.
- McDonagh, A. J. A study of adjustments and interests of first year college seminarians for the diocesan priesthood. Unpublished master's thesis, Loyola University, 1961.
- McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Maltz, H. E. Ontogenetic change in the meaning of concepts as measured by the semantic differential. Child Development, 1963, 34, 667-674.
- Megargee, E. I. The Edwards Sd Scale: A measure of adjustment or of dissimulation? In E. I. Megargee (Ed.), Research in Clinical Assessment. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Nimkoff, M. F., & Wood, A. L. Courtship and personality. American Journal of Sociology, 1947, 53, 263-269.
- Norman, W. T. Stability characteristics of the semantic differential. American Journal of Psychology, 1959, 72, 581-584.
- Osgood, C. E., & Luria, Z. A blind analysis of a case of multiple personality using the semantic differential. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 579-591.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University

of Illinois Press, 1957.

- Rakowski, A. A study of junior college seminarians on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Unpublished master's thesis, Loyola University, 1965.
- Reiss, I. L. Premarital sexual standards in America.
- Rogers, D. The psychology of adolescence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.
- Ross, R. T. Measures of the sex behavior of college males compared with Kinsey's results. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 753-755.
- Schneiders, A. A. Personality development and adjustment in adolescence. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960.
- Schoeppe, A., & Havighurst, R. J. A validation of development and adjustment hypotheses in adolescence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, 339-349.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Shell, A. S., O'Malley, J. M., & Johnsgard, K. W. The semantic differential and inferred identification. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 547-558.
- Smith, E. A. American youth culture. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1962.
- Strang, R. Behavior and background of students in college and secondary school. New York: Harper, 1937.
- Thigpen, C. H., & Cleckley, H. M. A case of multiple personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 135-151.
- Thigpen, C. H., & Cleckley, H. M. The three faces of Eve. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.
- Welsh, G. S., & Dahlstrom, W. G. (Eds.) Basic readings on the MMPI in psychology and medicine. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.



Willoughby, R. R. Sexuality in the second decade.  
Monographs of the Society for Research in Child  
Development, 1937, (Whole no. 2).

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design.  
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

## APPENDIX I

This appendix consists of a sample of the assessment battery which was administered to 105 college students studying for the priesthood at a large, metropolitan, diocesan seminary.

CODE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

AGE \_\_\_\_\_

You are being asked to complete the enclosed materials as part of a research project being conducted by members of the Psychology Department of Loyola University. Ultimately, it is hoped, such research will lead to improved policies and methods for educating young men for the priesthood, helping them to be more effective in fulfilling their vocations.

It is vital, of course, that you answer all questions as honestly and completely as possible. Since this is a research project, the information contained in your answers will be used ONLY for the purpose of gathering data on large groups of students. The information and answers you give are COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL and will be seen only by the researchers conducting the study in order to tabulate such group data. Subsequent to such tabulation, the materials you have completed will be destroyed. THE COMPLETED FORMS WILL NOT BE SEEN BY ANY SEMINARY FACULTY NOR WILL THEY BE AVAILABLE TO THE FACULTY IN ANY WAY. Thus, your anonymity is completely guaranteed.

Below is a list of issues concerning dating. Please read all statements and respond to all of them on the basis of your own true beliefs. Do this by reading each statement and then writing, in the space provided at its left, only one of the following numbers: 0,1,2,3,4. The meaning of each of these figures is

0: Strongly disagree      2: Undecided      4: Strongly agree  
1: Disagree              3: Agree

Dating is defined here as going out with a member of the opposite sex and excludes double and multiple dates and mixers.

(For research purposes, you must consider all statements as they are, without modifying them in any way.)

- \_\_\_ 1. Every person should be allowed to choose his or her dating partner freely and independently.
- \_\_\_ 2. Girls should be allowed to ask boys for dates.
- \_\_\_ 3. Boys and girls between 14 and 16 should be allowed to date without any adult supervision.
- \_\_\_ 4. It is all right to kiss on the first date.
- \_\_\_ 5. Boys of 12 should be allowed to date.
- \_\_\_ 6. Boys of 14 should be allowed to date.
- \_\_\_ 7. Girls of 12 should be allowed to date.
- \_\_\_ 8. Going on blind dates is all right.
- \_\_\_ 9. It is all right for dating partners to talk about sex.
- \_\_\_ 10. Adult supervision for first dates between 12 and 14 is unnecessary.
- \_\_\_ 11. Even when a girl is below 18, it is unnecessary for her parents to meet her boy friend before she goes out with him.
- \_\_\_ 12. Boys of 14 should be allowed to go steady if they wish.
- \_\_\_ 13. Boys of 16 should be allowed to go steady if they wish.
- \_\_\_ 14. Girls of 12 should be allowed to go steady if they wish.
- \_\_\_ 15. Girls of 14 should be allowed to go steady if they wish.
- \_\_\_ 16. Young people should make as much love on a date as they wish.
- \_\_\_ 17. It is not important for a person to remain pure until marriage.
- \_\_\_ 18. It is all right for a young dating couple to park on a lonely road.
- \_\_\_ 19. It is all right for a dating couple to kiss in public.
- \_\_\_ 20. Persons between 15 and 18 do not have to inform their parents where they will be while dating.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. It is all right for a boy to invite a girl to his home when no one is there.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. It is all right for a girl to invite a boy home when no one is there
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. When two young people are serious about each other, it is all right for them to make any kind of love.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. It is all right for a girl to wait for her date in a public place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Dating couples between 18 and 20 should be allowed to stay out as late as they wish.

Please answer the following questions as honestly and completely as possible. Remember, your answers are completely confidential and will be used only to tabulate information on large groups of students. These questionnaires will not be available to seminary faculty in any way. In these questions dating is defined as going with a member of the opposite sex and excludes double and multiple dating and mixers.

1. If you have dated, at what age did you begin dating? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How often did you date prior to beginning college?  
NEVER      SELDOM      OCCASIONALLY      FREQUENTLY      VERY OFTEN
3. How often are you dating currently?  
NEVER      SELDOM      OCCASIONALLY      FREQUENTLY      VERY OFTEN
4. How many different girls have you dated? \_\_\_\_\_
5. People date or do not date for a number of different reasons. Please give your reasons for dating or not dating. (Please use back if more space is needed).
6. What do you think seminary policy toward dating is?
7. What do you think seminary policy toward dating should be?

8. Do you think seminary policy has interfered with or contributed toward your personal development? In what ways has it done so?
9. Have your dating experiences generally been pleasant or unpleasant?
10. To which parent do you feel closer? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Are your attitudes and opinions generally more similar to those of your mother or father? \_\_\_\_\_
12. Have you ever been in love?
13. Have you ever gone steady?
14. Have you ever been engaged?
15. How often have you engaged in necking?  
NEVER SELDOM OCCASIONALLY FREQUENTLY VERY OFTEN
16. How often have you engaged in petting?  
NEVER SELDOM OCCASIONALLY FREQUENTLY VERY OFTEN
17. How often have you engaged in sexual intercourse?  
NEVER SELDOM OCCASIONALLY FREQUENTLY VERY OFTEN
18. How often have you engaged in masturbation?  
NEVER SELDOM OCCASIONALLY FREQUENTLY VERY OFTEN
19. How often have you experienced sexual fantasies?  
NEVER SELDOM OCCASIONALLY FREQUENTLY VERY OFTEN

## INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this part of the study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge these things against a series of descriptive scales. Please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check as follows:

fair XX : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ unfair

Or

fair \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your check as follows:

strong \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ weak

Or

strong \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ passive

Or

active \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check in the middle space:

safe \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : XX : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_ dangerous



IMPORTANT

1. Place your check-marks in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries:

\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_: XX : \_\_\_\_: XX \_\_\_\_

THIS

NOT THIS

2. Be sure you check every scale for every concept.  
Do not omit any.
3. Never put more than one check on a single scale;  
that is, do not check more than one space.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

WORK AT HIGH SPEED THROUGH THIS TEST. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. IT IS YOUR FIRST IMPRESSIONS, THE IMMEDIATE "FEELINGS" ABOUT THE ITEMS, THAT WE WANT. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.



## ME

Valuable	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Worthless
Clean	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Dirty
Distasteful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Tasty
Fast	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Slow
Passive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Active
Cold	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Hot
Large	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Small
Weak	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Strong
Shallow	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Deep

## GIRL

Worthless	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Valuable
Dirty	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Clean
Tasty	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Distasteful
Slow	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Fast
Active	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Passive
Hot	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Cold
Large	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Small
Strong	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Weak
Deep	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Shallow

MAN

Valuable	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Worthless
Clean	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Dirty
Distasteful	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Tasty
Fast	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Slow
Passive	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Active
Cold	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Hot
Large	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Small
Weak	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Strong
Shallow	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Deep

PRIEST

[illegible]

## MYSELF AS I WOULD LIKE TO BE

Valuable	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Worthless
Clean	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Dirty
Distasteful	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Tasty
Fast	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Slow
Passive	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Active
Cold	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Hot
Large	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Small
Weak	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Strong
Shallow	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Deep

## SEX

Worthless	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Valuable
Dirty	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Clean
Tasty	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Distasteful
Slow	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Fast
Active	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Passive
Hot	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Cold
Large	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Small
Strong	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Weak
Deep	____:____:____:____:____:____:____	Shallow

WOMAN

Valuable	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Worthless
Clean	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Dirty
Distasteful	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Tasty
Fast	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Slow
Passive	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Active
Cold	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Hot
Large	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Small
Weak	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Strong
Shallow	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	_____:	Deep

## SEMINARIAN

[illegible]

## APPENDIX II

This appendix includes a sample of the pilot questionnaire administered to a group of senior high school students studying for the priesthood at a diocesan seminary. Appendix II also includes partial results from this pilot administration of the questionnaire

You are being asked to fill out this questionnaire as part of a research project being conducted by members of the psychology department of Loyola University.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationships between social behavior and the personal development of the seminarian. Ultimately, it is hoped, such research will lead to improved policies and methods for educating young men for the priesthood, helping them to be more effective in fulfilling their vocations.

It is vital, of course, that you answer all questions as honestly and completely as possible. Since this is a research project, none of the information contained in the questionnaire will be used for any purpose other than gathering data on large groups of students.

The information you give is COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL and will be seen only by the researchers conducting the study. The questionnaires will not be seen by any seminary faculty nor will they be available to the faculty in any way.



Code # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Age \_\_\_\_\_

For questions 3, 4a, 5a, 14, 15, 16a, refer to the following explanations and encircle the corresponding alternative on the question itself:

- |                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. Never               | f. About once/2 months  |
| b. Less than once/year | g. Once/month           |
| c. About once/year     | h. Once/2 weeks         |
| d. About once/6 months | i. Weekly or more often |
| e. About once/3 months |                         |

1. Have you ever dated? Yes No
2. At what age did you have your first date? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Before entering the seminary how often did you date?  
 (See note at beginning of questionnaire.)  
 a b c d e f g h i j
4. Have you dated since entering the seminary? Yes No
- 4a. How often have you dated since entering the seminary?  
 a b c d e f g h i j
5. Are you dating currently? Yes No
- 5a. How often are you dating currently?  
 a b c d e f g h i j
6. If you have dated since entering the seminary or if you are currently dating, is your dating limited only to vacation periods, eg., summer, Christmas? Yes No
7. How many different girls have you dated? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Have you ever gone steady? (Going steady is here defined as a relationship in which each partner dates the other exclusively for an extended period of time.) Yes No
9. What is the longest period during which you have dated one girl exclusively? \_\_\_\_\_
10. How often have you gone steady? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you ever been engaged? (That is, have you ever entered into an agreement with a girl to be married at some future date?) \_\_\_\_\_
12. Have you ever attended a mixer? (A mixer is here defined as a social function at which girls are present.)  
 Yes No
13. At what age did you first attend a mixer? \_\_\_\_\_
14. How often did you attend mixers before entering the seminary?  
 a b c d e f g h i j
15. How often have you attended mixers since entering the seminary?  
 a b c d e f g h i j
16. Do you currently attend mixers? Yes No
- 16a. How often do you currently attend mixers?  
 a b c d e f g h i j

17. Would you date if seminary policy were completely permissive in this respect? Yes No
18. Would you date if seminary policy were completely restrictive in this respect? Yes No
19. Do your parents object to you dating? Yes No
20. Have your parents encouraged you to date or to date more often? Yes No
21. In whose company do you feel most comfortable?  
Males Females Neither Both
22. Do you feel that not dating has been beneficial to your personal development?
23. Do you feel that not dating has been detrimental to your personal development?
24. Do you feel that dating has been beneficial to your personal development?
25. Do you feel that dating has been detrimental to your personal development?
26. Have you known girls that you would like to have dated? Yes No
27. If you have known girls that you would like to have dated and did not date them, give your reasons.
28. Do you feel that being a seminarian has restricted your dating experiences? Yes No
29. If you have dated have you done so secretly or openly?  
Secretly Openly
30. Do your parents know you date? Yes No
31. Do your friends know you date? Yes No

32. Does your spiritual director or counselor know you date? Yes No
33. Have your dating experiences been successful or have they been negative experiences? Explain:
34. Do you daydream about girls? Yes No
35. Do you daydream about dating? Yes No
36. Do you feel that daydreaming about girls has been morally harmful to you? Yes No
37. How do you go about meeting girls?
- a. through parents
  - b. through brothers and sisters
  - c. through seminary friends
  - d. through friends outside the seminary
  - e. at mixers
  - f. other
38. What do you feel seminary policy toward dating should be?
39. What do you think seminary policy toward dating is?
40. Do you feel some conflict about whether or not to date? Explain:
- 40a. If yes, have you discussed this conflict with someone? Yes No
- 40b. With whom have you discussed it? \_\_\_\_\_
- 40c. Has the discussion been helpful in resolving the conflict? Yes No
41. With whom do you discuss dating and dating experiences?
42. Briefly summarize your reasons for dating or for not dating.

43. Do you think the decision to date or not should be left to the individual, or should the seminary have a clearly stated dating policy for its students? Explain:

44. Please give your impressions of this questionnaire. Comment on your reactions to it, its adequacy, inclusiveness, etc.

## RESULTS

## 1. Have you ever dated?

Yes:	N=51	63.8%
No:	N=29	36.2%

## 2. At what age did you have your first date?

12	N=1	1.3%	15	N=9	11.3%
13	N=3	3.8%	16	N=25	31.3%
14	N=4	5.0%	17	N=9	11.3%
No Answer (NA):		N=29	36.6%		

## 3. Before entering the seminary how often did you date?

Never	N=64	80.0%
Less than once/year	N=6	7.5%
About once/year	N=0	0.0%
About once/6 months	N=3	3.8%
About once/3 months	N=0	0.0%
About once/2 months	N=3	3.8%
Once/month	N=2	2.5%
Once/2 weeks	N=1	1.3%
Weekly or more often	N=0	0.0%
NA:	N=1	1.3%

## 4. Have you dated since entering the seminary?

Yes	N=49	61.3%
No	N=31	38.8%

## 4a. How often have you dated since entering the seminary?

Never	N=28	35.0%
Less than once/year	N=7	8.8%
About once/year	N=3	3.8%
About once/6 months	N=8	10.0%
About once/3 months	N=6	7.5%
About once/2 months	N=2	2.5%
About once/month	N=8	10.0%
Once/2 weeks	N=7	8.8%
Weekly or more often	N=6	7.5%
NA	N=5	6.3%

## 5. Are you dating currently?

Yes	N=33	41.3%
No	N=46	57.5%
NA	N=1	1.3%

## 5a. How often are you dating currently?

Never	N=30	37.5%
Less than once/year	N= 2	2.5%
About once/year	N= 1	1.3%
About once/6 months	N= 4	5.0%
About once/3 months	N= 2	2.5%
About once/2 months	N= 3	3.8%
Once/month	N= 9	11.3%
Once/2 weeks	N= 7	8.8%
Weekly or more often	N= 7	8.8%
NA	N=15	18.8%

6. If you have dated since entering the seminary or if you currently date, is your dating limited only to vacation periods, eg., summer, Christmas?

Yes: N=12 15.0%  
 No: N=54 67.5%  
 NA: N=14 17.5%

7. How many different girls have you dated?

0 N=22  
 1 N=11  
 2 N=13  
 3 N= 9  
 4 N= 3  
 5 N= 3  
 6 N= 1  
 7 N= 3  
 8 N= 4  
 9 N= 0  
 10 N= 1  
 15-20 N= 1  
 25 N= 1  
 NA N= 7

8. Have you ever gone steady?

Yes: N=8 10.0%  
 No: N=71 88.8%  
 NA: N=1 1.3%

10. How often have you gone steady?

0 N=70 87.5%  
 Once N= 9 11.3%  
 Twice N= 1 1.3%

11. Have you ever been engaged?

Yes: N=00 0.0%  
 No: N=78 97.5%  
 NA: N= 2 2.5%

12. Have you ever attended a mixer?

Yes: N=73 91.3%  
No: N= 7 8.8%

13. At what age did you first attend a mixer?

10 N= 1  
12 N= 1  
13 N=23  
14 N=13  
15 N=15  
16 N=17  
17 N= 3  
NA N= 7

16. Do you currently attend mixers?

Yes: N=53 66.3%  
No: N=25 31.3%  
NA: N= 2 2.5%

17. Would you date if seminary policy were completely permissive in this respect?

Yes: N=66 82.5%  
No: N=13 16.3%  
NA: N= 1 1.3%

18. Would you date if seminary policy were completely restrictive in this respect?

Yes: N=40 50.0%  
No: N=40 50.0%

19. Do your parents object to you dating?

Yes: N= 7 8.8%  
No: N=70 87.5%  
NA: N= 3 3.8%

21. In whose company do you feel most comfortable?

Males N=25 31.3%  
Females N= 3 3.8%  
Neither N= 4 5.0%  
Both N=47 58.8%  
Neither & Both N= 1 1.3%

22. Do you feel that not dating has been beneficial to your personal development?

Yes: N= 4 5.0%  
No: N=70 87.5%  
NA: N= 6 7.5%

23. Do you feel that not dating has been detrimental to your personal development?

Yes:	N=30	37.5%
No:	N=39	48.8%
NA:	N=11	13.8%

24. Do you feel that dating has been beneficial to your personal development?

Yes:	N=49	61.3%
No:	N=15	18.8%
NA:	N=16	20.0%

25. Do you feel that dating has been detrimental to your personal development?

Yes:	N= 4	5.0%
No:	N=56	70.0%
NA:	N=20	25.0%

26. Have you known girls you would like to have dated?

Yes:	N=77	96.3%
No:	N= 3	3.8%

28. Do you feel that being a seminarian has restricted your dating experiences?

Yes:	N=48	60.0%
No:	N=31	38.8%
NA:	N= 1	1.3%

32. Does your spiritual director or counselor know you date?

Yes:	N=26	32.5%
No:	N=25	31.3%
NA:	N=29	36.3%



### APPENDIX III

Appendix III consists of summaries of analyses of variance conducted on each of the MMPI clinical scales, the K-scale, and the mean of the clinical scales. Analyses of variance conducted on six scales of the EPPS are also included.

TABLE A

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale K: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	81.04	.94
Error	101	86.37	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE B

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Hs: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	5.87	.07
Error	101	84.27	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE C

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale D: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	375.25	3.44
Error	101	109.08	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE D

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Hy: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	19.91	.25
Error	101	79.47	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE F

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Mf: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	80.00	.69
Error	101	116.32	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE G

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Pa: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	40.38	.43
Error	101	94.44	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE H

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale: Pt: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	157.23	1.27
Error	101	123.65	
Total	104		

$p > .05$



TABLE I

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Sc: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	95.32	.87
Error	101	109.31	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE J

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Ma: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	195.78	2.56
Error	101	76.22	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE K

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
MMPI Scale Si: Groups N, S, O, F and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	185.98	2.07
Error	101	89.81	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE L

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
Mean of 10 MMPI Clinical Scales: Groups N, S, O, F, VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	33.71	.78
Error	101	42.77	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE M

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale, Aut: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	134.91	.24
Error	101	559.34	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE N

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale Aff: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	201.78	.26
Error	101	781.26	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE 0

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale, Suc: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	141.13	.23
Error	101	601.03	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE P

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale, Nur: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	9.64	.02
Error	101	605.13	
Total	104		

$p > .05$



TABLE Q

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale, Het: Groups N, S, O, P, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	895.92	1.23
Error	101	728.55	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

TABLE R

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores on  
EPPS Scale, Agg: Groups N, S, O, F, and VO

Source	df	MS	F
Treatment	3	202.84	.24
Error	101	838.79	
Total	104		

$p > .05$

## APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Joseph V. Rizzo has been read and approved by members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 15, 1970  
Date

Fred Kobler  
Signature of Advisor